THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXXXXIX NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 21, 1939 NUMBER 1281

Their Majesties and Politics

The British seem to be making their usual mistake of wishful thinking about America. The extraordinarily cordial reception given the King and Queen has caused some people in London to decide that the United States is just another Dominion, after all, and that it can now be used as an ace up the sleeve in the European poker game. Those who entertain this notion are badly mistaken. The Americans liked the King, and the Queen even better, as charming, friendly young people being put through a miserable ordeal. The crowds along the streets came out of curiosity or to be able to say that they were there, and cheered out of that unvarying American politeness that Europeans always misunderstand. But very few minds have been changed, by the sight of two nice young people, regarding Chamberlain's foreign policy or the extent to which Americans should support it. They know, if only instinctively, that the British Tories dislike our people only a little less than they dislike the Russians. The Tories would be glad to have an alliance with this country, on the dubious theory that they could then afford to tell Moscow to go to hell. If they can't get such an alliance, they will at least exaggerate Anglo-American friendship for all they are worth.

Whose Ambassador Is Mr. Kennedy?

Some remarkable statements about Ambassador Kennedy are now in circulation in London. A recent issue of The Week declares that Mr. Kennedy has consistently supported the Chamberlain policy of appeasement, just as he worked for Franco's victory in Spain. The Week asserts that Ambassador Kennedy has been

> the principal apologist for Mr. Chamberlain in Washington, and at the same time was known to be informing Mr. Chamberlain that in reality American opinion—serious American opinion—so far from being hostile to Munichism, was really supporting it and that therefore Mr. Chamberlain did not really need to worry about the apparent outbursts of indignation from the other side, regardless of the quarter from which they came.

These charges are serious enough, but The Week goes still further. It accuses Mr. Kennedy of telling the British government that it need not worry about anything that Mr. Roosevelt may say because (1) "It will be my friends that are in the White House in 1940" and (2) "Roosevelt is run by the Jews and all the anti-fascist sentiment in the United States is really created by the Jews, who control the press."

We do not know whether these charges are true; but we do know that it is an important matter when such accusations dealing with the American Ambassador to the Court of St. James are openly made in a widely circulated periodical. This is too critical a moment in world history for any ambassador to act independently of his government. Officially, he should have no views whatever, least of all any in conflict with his superior. If the charges of The Week are even 10 percent true, Mr. Kennedy should come home.

CONTENTS

The Week 169

Editorials

The Bear Sniffs the Trap 172
The Spanish Refugees 173
A Fair Chance for the WPA 174

General Articles

America and the Next War: II 175
Freud's "Interpretation of Dreams" . . . . . George Soule 178
Looking at 1940 . . . . . Bruce Bliven 182
Not in the Cables . . . . . Richard J. Walsh and Norbert Guterman 185
Shoot the Works . . . . . Heywood Broun 186
Washington Notes . . . . . T. R. B. 187
Other People's Money . . . John T. Flynn 188
The Caravan (II) and Abe . Otis Ferguson 189
The Bandwagon 190

Correspondence 190

Books in Review

Notes on a Writers' Congress . Malcolm Cowley 192
The Trimmed Lamp . . . Rebecca Pitts 193
The Deathbed of a Republic . Ralph Bates 194
Yale Loses One Vote . . Bruce Bliven Jr. 194
A Study in Black and White . . . . . Charles S. Johnson 195
New Books: A Reader's List 196
Notes About Books and Magazines 196

LICENSED TO NNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Neutrality—Hobson's Choice

The contest in Congress over neutrality legislation has settled down to a straight issue between those who want to modify the existing law by repealing the obligatory arms embargo and extending the cash-and-carry plan to munitions, and those who want to retain the 1937 Act substantially as it was written. The administration is behind the first plan, for the obvious reason that it wants to support Britain and France in any war with Hitler; the opposition is composed of those who do not wish to take any unnecessary chance of becoming involved in a European conflict. It is predicted that the administration plan will probably win in the House, but that the Senate isolationists will kill it, by a filibuster if necessary. We regard this struggle as unfortunate. Either result would have unwholesome repercussions. If the administration wins, the effect will be that of giving a blank check to the Chamberlain and Daladier governments, who cannot be trusted to support democratic or other aims vital to this country. If the opposition wins, as it probably will, Hitler and Mussolini will represent the result as support for them. Would it not be better for the administration to announce that it will not press Congress to go further in aiding France and Britain until the country shall be satisfied that these nations have given up appeasement and are standing only for aims that America can endorse?

Frightfulness in Czechia

When the Germans seized Bohemia and Moravia, we knew that they would rule there as heavy-fisted conquerors. We remembered what had been done in Austria and reasoned that the Czechs, as an alien race and a stubborn, hard-headed one, would be given harsher treatment than the comparatively easy-going Viennese. We resolved not to get too much upset every day about the news from Czechia. But our resolution has failed. We have been reading of the reign of terror instituted after the shooting of a German police officer at Kladno, how a thousand leading citizens were put in jail, a $20,000 fine levied, all public gatherings stopped and all doors and windows ordered closed from 8 P.M. to 5 A.M. (This last would be no hardship to the Nazis, who have a horror of ventilation.) In spite of our resolution, these accounts have made us boiling mad. Pan-German savagery is so far below normal human standards that we doubt we shall ever be able to brace ourselves against it, no matter how long it lasts.

Now They Confess

Germany and Italy have now stopped being hypocritical in regard to one important matter, and we must confess that in spite of the improvement, we don't

ting the size and extent of their aid to Franco in Spain. Hitler indeed boasts about the presence of a larger number of Germans than even the Loyalist government had guessed. Mussolini flatly agrees that Italian submarines committed the acts of piracy in the Mediterranean denounced by the Non-Intervention Committee, of which Italy was a member. If anyone still thought the Fascist powers had the remnants of honesty or respect for obligations, these confessions must have destroyed such illusions. We doubt that anybody held them.

Friends of Pope Pius

Pope Pius XII has received in Rome and personally thanked 3,200 of Franco's troops for defending "the faith and civilization" of Spain. He praised them for having brought about "a triumph of the Christian ideal." Meanwhile reports from Spain reiterate that at least 500,000 Loyalists are prisoners of Franco, and that executions of these and others still being arrested are taking place daily. It is said that in the first five weeks of Franco's control of Madrid and the central area 35,000 persons were executed. The Fascist press has announced, as we reported several weeks ago, that 400 trials a day are held in Madrid alone. In contrast to the Fascist treatment of their victims, we may recall that the Republic had announced in 1937 that upon its victory it would extend a general amnesty to all Spaniards.

"You have made sacrifices," the Pope said, "up to the point of heroism to defend the cause of God and religion." Hitler and Mussolini know very well that the cause of Franco was the cause of fascism. No doubt they now feel sure that they have in the Pope a strong ally.

Mgr. Sheen on Religious Liberty

Mgr. Fulton J. Sheen of Catholic University made a startling statement the other day. "Religious freedom," said Mgr. Sheen, in a public address in Brooklyn, "does not mean freedom to be anti-religious." Mgr. Sheen is just 100 percent wrong. Religious freedom, in America, means freedom to have any attitude you like toward religion, including that of rejecting all faiths if you prefer. If he had his way, Mgr. Sheen would evidently compel everybody to join one church or another. In the same address, he proposed that the "Jew, Catholic and Protestant teachers of New York" should organize a combined spy system through which teachers guilty of radicalism should be hounded out of the public schools. Mgr. Sheen appears to be guilty of a confusion between religious views and political attitudes. Religion to him is identical with conservatism in the political and economic field. It is fortunate for American liberty that neither Mgr. Sheen or anyone who thinks like him is as yet in a position to dictate

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Poet in Washington

Herman Melville and Edwin Arlington Robinson both worked as clerks in the New York Customs House. Walt Whitman was a clerk in the Treasury Department, after being discharged from the Department of the Interior when somebody heard that he had written "Leaves of Grass." These, however, are unusual cases. Except for a few posts in the foreign service, our government has never made a practice of giving jobs to men of letters. Mr. Roosevelt was setting a new precedent last week when he nominated Archibald MacLeish as Librarian of Congress. MacLeish is a scholar as well as a good poet and he should fill the place with distinction. We sympathize with the librarians who feel that this office should go to a trained member of their own profession; but in this case they might yield it gracefully to a man who has written many of the books they choose and catalogue. As for Representative Thomas of New Jersey, the Dies committeeman who attacked MacLeish in Congress as a Red, he has evidently reached the point where he thinks that anybody is a dangerous Communist if he can read and write.

Bad Boys of Labor

Popular belief, carefully nourished by reactionary publicity, holds that John L. Lewis and the CIO are the bad boys of the industrial scene, sympathetic with Reds and stirring up trouble, while William Green and the AFL are tractable and well behaved. Facts, however, show who is really splitting the forces of labor and causing unjustified strife. One set of these facts is now apparent in Flint and Saginaw, Michigan. The Martin faction of the United Auto Workers, affiliated with the AFL, has called a strike in certain General Motors plants, solely for recognition of its bargaining "rights"; the CIO members are remaining at work, under contract. Martin, a turbulent and irresponsible union president, formerly insisted on splitting his organization, although almost all the other officials were against him and he had the support of only a minority of the rank and file. Green, for the AFL, received him and his faction with open arms. In most of the plants where, because Martin thought he was strongest, he called the strike, he has not been able to interfere with production. If the trouble becomes serious it will be only because the strike is supported by the local teamsters, affiliated with the AFL.

Green has followed the same tactics with the textile workers. The TWU, organized under the CIO, comprises the great majority of union textile workers; it is the third largest union in the country, exceeded in membership only by the carpenters and the miners. But Green has encouraged the separatism of a small dissident faction, granting it an AFL charter. The jurisdictional claims of the New York unions is traceable to conservative building trades and other locals affiliated with the AFL.

"Mein Kampf" Kampf Is Decided

In an opinion by Judge Charles E. Clark, dean of the Yale Law School until his recent appointment to the bench, the Federal Circuit Court of Appeals has banned the non-copyrighted edition of Hitler's "Mein Kampf" published by Stackpole. The Court rejects the plea of the defendants that the copyright is invalid because Hitler was "stateless" at the time it was granted, ruling that the law is intended to protect all authors except citizens of countries that do not grant reciprocal privileges to Americans. In this connection Judge Clark agrees with the position previously taken by The New Republic, when he writes:

> Any other result than this would be unfortunate, for it would mean that stateless aliens cannot be secure even in their literary property. True, the problem of statelessness has only become acute of late years, but it promises to become increasingly difficult as time goes on. The rule contended for by the defendants would mean that the United States, contrary to its general policy and tradition, is putting another obstacle in the way of survival of homeless refugees, of whom many have been students and scholars and writers.

After rejecting other arguments advanced by Stackpole, the opinion ends by declaring:

> Under the circumstances of entire absence of title or right in the defendants, their claim that the equities are in their favor—that they are engaged in a service of great social value in thus publishing this book—seems indeed bold.

The judgment reverses the District Court and directs it to grant a preliminary injunction against the Stackpole edition. Henceforth, unless the defendants appeal to the Supreme Court, it will be legal to sell only the copyrighted edition published by Reynal and Hitchcock.

News Notes of a Week

The 907 German-Jewish refugees on the liner "St. Louis" were saved from return to Germany by being granted temporary refuge in Belgium, France, the Netherlands and England. . . . China's War Minister, Ho Ying-chin, reported that the Japanese losses have been 864,500 men killed, wounded and missing since the war began. This is about five times as many as the Japanese admit. . . . Four thousand officers, non-coms and privates of the former Czechoslovak army, and six aviators with three bombing planes, escaped to Poland over the Slovakian border. It was predicted that German troops would soon occupy most of Slovakia. . . . The German Evangelical Consistory informed Pastor Martin Niemoller, who has been a prisoner of the Nazis since July 1, 1937, that he might be placed on the waiting list, a euphe-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

. . . Havana papers reported that the Executive Committee of the Spanish Socialist Party, meeting in Paris, had expelled Luis Araquistain from the party for divulging secrets and for his attacks on ex-Premier Negrín and other noted Spanish Socialists. . . . Mrs. Ruth Marie Rubens pleaded guilty in the Moscow Regional Court to entering the Soviet Union on a false American passport in the name of Robinson. She was sentenced to eighteen months' imprisonment, but the judge said that since she had already been in prison eighteen months, she needed to serve only one more day. Nothing was known about the fate of her husband, presumably still held on more serious charges.

Norman Thomas spoke at a victory meeting of the American Civil Liberties Union in Journal Square, Jersey City, at almost exactly the same spot from which he was forcibly removed by policemen on April 30, 1938. This time the police, under Hague's orders, protected the meeting from the many young Coughlinites present. One of these, giving the Fascist salute, was reported to have shouted, "I'm a Coughlinite, I live in Jersey City and I have a right to break up this meeting if I want to."

The Bear Sniffs the Trap

In our issue of may 31, Professor Frederick L. Schuman expressed skepticism about the success of the attempt to form an alliance between Britain and the Soviet Union against German aggression. Since then, we have been told again and again by news dispatches originating in London and Paris that such an agreement was on the point of conclusion. But it has not been made. At present the chances look slimmer than ever. We shall not believe that a firm understanding has been achieved unless we see it. Even then, we shall strongly suspect, as long as the Chamberlain government remains in power, that it will be a treaty to be honored in the breach rather than in the observance.

The latest hitch arose over the refusal of the British Cabinet to extend its guarantee over Latvia, Estonia and Finland, Baltic nations bordering on the Soviet Union. Moscow would not promise to help Britain unless Britain would include these small nations in the arrangement, because Moscow suspected that it was Chamberlain's purpose to involve her in a war with Germany without firmly binding Britain to come to her aid. Whitehall, it was reported, recognized that something must be done to allay the Russian suspicion which had all along rendered the negotiations difficult. Some leading statesman must be sent to Moscow to create a feeling of confidence.

Would Halifax go, or possibly Chamberlain himself? No dignitary had been too important to go to Paris—or to Munich—when critical decisions had to be Mr. William Strang. No doubt Mr. Strang is a worthy foreign-office expert, but he is not a principal. It held him over the week-end for instructions from Lord Halifax. And it was at first proposed to have him make the journey by train, so as to kill more time. Meanwhile Lord Halifax made a speech in Parliament in which he extended the hand of conciliation to Hitler on the colonial issue. The timing was perfect—for the appeasers who wish to wreck a Russian alliance. Rumors came from Paris that Hitler was about to make new proposals to the western "democracies." It was also stated that Pope Pius had again suggested a conference of Germany, Italy, Britain and France—excluding the USSR. Almost everything has been done to make Mr. Strang's task more difficult.

Professor Schuman agrees with the Kremlin in seeing as Chamberlain's leading purpose a design to keep the Soviet Union and Germany antagonistic, to check Hitler in the west but not in the east, enticing Russia to oppose the German *Drang Nach Osten* while avoiding any binding obligation to Moscow. If the pledges to Poland and Rumania seem to contradict this suspicion, Mr. Schuman answers by saying: "Chamberlain knew that Warsaw and Bucharest could neither defend nor be defended by London and Paris. . . . The Anglo-French pledges, carefully hedged with weasel words, were bait. If Moscow should bite and assume obligations leading to a Nazi-Soviet clash, Paris and London could find plausible pretexts for abandoning the buffer states to the mercies of the combatants and reverting to neutrality and non-intervention."

Whether one attributes the vagaries of British foreign policy to shrewd design or to stupidity, the result will probably be the same. Blundering can set and spring a trap as well as treachery. And either, in case the quarry is wary, can come to grief in the same way. The Soviet Union is suspicious, no matter what grounds for suspicion exist. Unless the suspicion can be allayed and she can be brought into a firm stop-Hitler alliance, she will remain in the isolation to which Munich consigned her. In that case the British-French alliance, with its satellites, is not strong enough to overawe Hitler and Mussolini, and the only likely outcome is a second Munich.

Ultimately, to be sure, negotiations for a settlement of European problems constitute the only alternative to war. But the time for the western allies to negotiate will come only when they can no longer be terrified by threats of force. The simple and logical way to proceed is first to form the stop-Hitler alliance, with the Soviet Union as an indispensable partner, and then to negotiate. In such negotiations, too, Moscow must naturally be a full partner. It is true that Germany is afraid of "encirclement" and protests against it. But that is the very reason for achieving the ring of steel. Let her be reassured that, once it is achieved, the powers will dis-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tice. The outlines for such a settlement might even now be laid down, with the clear understanding that no offers will be made until the military alliance is completed. But the untrustworthiness of the appeasers is made manifest by the fact that they are always evincing readiness to negotiate while German steel is against their bellies.

The first essential of a clear and effective policy is a change of government in London and possibly one in Paris as well. If the British really want to reassure Moscow, the best way is to get rid of Chamberlain, Halifax and Simon. If the French want to create Soviet confidence, they should dispense with Bonnet at least. Even if the Soviet statesmen should yield to the dubious blandishments of the Tory rulers of democracy, we doubt that aggression can be stopped or peace in the end made secure.

The Spanish Refugees

NO ONE REALLY KNOWS how many Spanish Republican refugees there are in France. The men who are in charge of them don't know. People in closest touch with the refugee work say there are from 200,000 to 250,000 civilians, but they point out immediately that an estimate so vague shows more ignorance than knowledge. They are a little surer of the number of soldiers, who are in four big camps, whereas the civilians are scattered all over France. There are about 120,000 ex-combatants.

Conditions have slowly improved in the camps. Those for the soldiers are no longer the plague-spots they were at first. Now at least shacks have been built —formerly the men tried to burrow into the sand for shelter, but found water eight inches down. Now there is food for everyone, even though there isn't enough and the quality is generally bad. There is some medical care.

For the civilian refugees things are better too; they are settling down to wait for whatever is going to happen to them. But that things are better does not mean they are decent. One camp, for 150 women and children, is an abandoned stone prison, with one waterspout in the courtyard and no toilet facilities of any kind. The American committee that visited it some weeks ago reported that even as a place to confine hardened criminals it would be outrageously unfit. But the relief campaigns in all countries have helped to make things bearable. The Medical Bureau and North American Committee's Refugee Relief Campaign in the United States has sent about $50,000 in the past two months to be translated into food, clothing and shelter; French campaigns have collected much more.

Yet the greatest problem of all has not been solved concentration camps indefinitely. The French government, which might easily have made provision for the Spanish peasants to settle in empty French villages, is doing nothing. In desperation some refugees have gone back to Spain, but the latest reports are that many of these have been executed or imprisoned and others are trying to return to the comparative liberty of a French concentration camp. At present, no more refugees are willing to risk their lives in Franco's Spain.

The first real hope came with Mexico's admission of several thousands. Others are now on the way, and it is said that Mexico will accept up to 40,000. Even so she will not have solved the problem, but her generous example may move other countries—especially Latin American countries—to offer refuge. Peasants and trained technicians will be the best equipped to settle in Mexico; the Mexican trade unions are coöperating in placing them. Negotiations are in progress with other countries; if they are willing to accept some refugees, then it will be a matter of raising money to transport them and settle them.

But for writers, artists, scholars, scientists and other intellectuals, Mexico offers no solution. Only schoolteachers will readily find jobs, and those not in the cultural center of the country but in villages. In Mexico City, exiled sculptors, professors and other highly trained specialists will find that they are living in a poor country that can just barely support its own intellectuals. A successful novel may bring its author 500 pesos, about $100.

In this situation two proposals have been made, both of which we heartily endorse. The first is that there be established in this country a center of Spanish culture, if possible in connection with one of our own universities. To such a center, staffed by the leading Spanish authorities in law, the sciences, languages, the arts and literature, students from all Latin America would be attracted; its publications could be as authoritative for the Spanish-speaking Americas as those of Madrid and Barcelona used to be. A tremendous stimulus would be given our own arts and sciences by the addition of the rich Spanish culture. The Germans who have come to this country have already shown us what such a contribution can mean.

Equally important could be the effect on Pan-American relations. Everyone knows by this time of the activities of the German and Italian colonies in South America; their propaganda has the ring of triumph now that Franco controls the motherland of all Latin America. And in every country Francoists, as progressives warned America they would, are spreading hatred of the United States. A center for liberal Spanish culture would be a powerful influence on the South American countries.

The second proposal that has been made is that a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this project and in all other ways that Americans can help to find new homes for the refugees. We badly need such a coördinating body of the highest prestige. If we are serious about the defense of democracy we can help to save some of the world's finest and bravest democrats. And they will fight our battle against the dangerous influence of anti-democratic ideas in this hemisphere.

A Fair Chance for the WPA

CONGRESS THIS WEEK is considering a bill for the WPA that has been presented to the House by the Appropriations subcommittee. If it passes in its present form, it will do the enterprise great harm. Yet if any change is to be made, the WPA in our opinion ought to be much strengthened. The most precious thing America possesses is its man power, of which nearly 10 percent is now represented by those who are or have recently been on WPA, and 20 percent is unable to find private employment.

In contrast to this bad measure, an excellent bill for improving the WPA has been introduced in the upper house by Senator James E. Murray of Montana and in the lower one by Representative Joseph E. Casey of Massachusetts. The Murray-Casey bill, in the first place, would establish a fixed relation between the number of unemployed in the country and the number of WPA jobs. For the next year, the second figure would be set at 3,000,000, which is a fair minimum of those who are qualified for such jobs and badly need them at the moment.

The bill would put the WPA on a continuing basis. Nothing has done more harm than the necessity of fighting every few months in Congress for additional appropriations, with the effort continually made, as now, to knife the whole enterprise.

The bill provides that all workers unable to find jobs in private industry shall be eligible for the WPA if they want work and are competent to perform it. One of the great evils of the WPA has been the fact that a man had to sign a virtual "pauper's oath" and must have lost all his property and resources of every kind, before he could go on the WPA, in spite of the fact that this agency was supposed to maintain his morale as a self-respecting worker. In most cases, much of his morale has been destroyed before he is considered eligible. This provision would give the country something it totally lacks, an automatic, continuous and reliable census of unemployment.

The measure would maintain all the present types of work, including the valuable white-collar and art projects that have been so unfairly attacked. It would also give the WPA new and desirable powers to construct schools, hospitals and public housing

ply with wage-hour minimums; rights of collective bargaining would be guaranteed; contracts would have to contain provisions that contractors shall not violate the right of collective bargaining. A Bureau of Labor Relations would be set up to develop proper labor relations.

The Murray-Casey bill carries an appropriation of $2,250,000,000 for the next fiscal year, to furnish an average of 3,000,000 jobs. President Roosevelt has asked only $1,477,000,000 to provide an average of only 2,000,000 jobs. Nearly every competent authority in Washington believes that the President's figure is much too low. A year-round average of 2,000,000 must include allowance for many more than that number in mid-winter, when private employment is at a minimum. It means therefore that at the low point, in midsummer, there would be enough money for only about 1,500,000 jobs, taking care of perhaps one in seven of the unemployed.

This bill looks even better compared to the shocking measure which, as we go to press, is being presented to the House by the Appropriations subcommittee. In its bill the use of "prevailing wages" is abandoned and the men on WPA must work 130 hours a month for a subsistence wage. The result of this of course will be to break down wage standards in private industry all over the country, curtail purchasing power and make the depression worse. No WPA building project is to cost more than $25,000, a limit so foolish one hardly needs to argue against it. The Federal Theatre Project would be abolished and all other white-collar projects would be stopped unless individual localities chose to sponsor them. The total appropriation is only two-thirds as large as every informed person knows to be necessary. The "economizers" have had their way in the making of this bill, with the result that every honest and intelligent member of Congress must be heartily ashamed of the result.

THE NEW REPUBLIC
A Journal of Opinion

Editors
BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE STARK YOUNG

Assistant Editors: OTIS FERGUSON ELIZABETH HULING

Contributing Editors
JAMES BENÉT BRUCE BLIVEN JR. H. N. BRAILSFORD
HEYWOOD BROUN JOHN T. FLYNN WALDO FRANK
E. C. LINDEMAN JON. MITCHELL LEWIS MUMFORD
REXFORD G. TUGWELL

Treasurer: DANIEL MEBANE

E. G. WOOD, *Advertising Manager* — BYRON DEXTER, *Circulation Manager*

SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS;

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

America and the Next War: II

WHAT ATTITUDE should Americans take regarding a possible war in Europe? In the belief that our readers will be interested to know the views of New Republic contributors on this subject, we recently addressed an inquiry to a group of nearly 250 individuals who have appeared in our pages in the past year. The questions asked them are reprinted at the bottom of the page.

Thus far, policy No. 4 leads with forty-seven votes and policy No. 2 is second with forty-two. In last week's New Republic we quoted from some of the statements supporting one or the other of these policies. We present below some of the letters received from those voting for the other choices. Of these the fifth received thirty-three votes, the sixth fifteen, the third eight, the seventh six and the first, three. Among those voting for policy No. 5 were Victor Yakhontoff, Dickinson S. Miller, LeGarde S. Doughty, Felice Swados, Esther Gelders, Robert Goldsmith, Willard Maas and Mentana Galleani.

Democracy is endangered by fascism not only in Europe but in Asia and the Americas as well. To resist its further triumphs it is not necessary to start a war, or to enter into any binding agreements with any other powers. What is quite necessary is to stand squarely and resolutely behind the idea of democracy and against fascists or any other aggressors by offering material support to the victims of aggression (not in the way it was done during the Spanish war or even now *vis-a-vis* China in her struggle with Japan). A united front of the United States, the Soviet Union, France and Great Britain (not represented by Chamberlain, or any Munichites) would do the trick without resort to arms. VICTOR YAKHONTOFF

I think it of the utmost importance that we should make it clear now that we are to be reckoned with if aggression thrusts war on France and Britain.

As to the form of our assistance, I should probably favor No. 5 with the preconditions specified in No. 4 strictly required, although the conduct of Britain and France in the last eight years strains one's capacity for contempt, intellectual and moral—but especially intellectual.

DICKINSON S. MILLER

Policy No. 5—or No. 6 if it comes to that—should be employed not because it is for or against any particular nations, but because it is for the more acceptable current ideology which is at least a motion toward the ultimate liberal ideology. The ultimate liberal ideology is more important than the current convenience of tentative peace. Even taking the matter without any consideration of principle, Nazi domination of Europe might (I almost say would) destroy the United States with the rest.

LE GARDE S. DOUGHTY

Embargo against aggressors. Economic and financial aid to nations defending themselves against aggression.

This is practically the same as your No. 5, except that

Seven Possible Courses for American Foreign Policy

1. Neutrality of the kind existing before 1917—marked by emphasis on the traditional rights of the neutral to sell, to ship, to travel, to lend to all belligerents. This neutrality to be accompanied by political and military isolation.

2. A rigorous attempt to keep out of war by embargoing the sale at least of munitions, forbidding loans and travel, and restricting the sale of other goods by some such measure as the "cash-and-carry plan." It is recognized that this policy in fact will favor Great Britain and France, though its chief emphasis is to keep out of war by maintaining legal neutrality.

3. Modification of (2) by allowing the sale of munitions and possibly the extension of loans, with the intention of giving more help to Britain and her allies, even at somewhat greater risk of being drawn into war.

4. The same sort of help for Great Britain—but only after she has helped herself by entering into a bloc of anti-Fascist powers (including Russia) and has given binding assurances that she is fighting for democratic aims.

5. One-sided economic embargoes, applied only against "aggressors" or "treaty violators"—with whatever risk of war this policy may bring.

6. Military help for Great Britain and her allies, if that is necessary to keep them from being defeated, but only on conditions such as those listed above.

7. A military alliance with Great Britain, either on the ground that this is the only means of preventing war, or else on the ground that we cannot afford to let Germany dominate Europe and destroy the British navy.

Above are given the questions we asked of nearly 250 New Republic contributors. What do our readers believe is the wisest course for America to follow? We invite you to write us saying which of the foregoing policies, or which combination of them, you prefer. We hope to present some of the opinions of our readers in The New Republic at a later date.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I do not put the word *aggressors* in quotes. This plan implies active financial aid to China and every possible effort to stop reprisals against Spanish republicans. Also governmental aid in rehabilitating Spanish, Czech, etc., refugees.

ESTHER GELDERS

The first position is, I believe, untenable. Strict isolation would mean virtual collapse for the United States with all the evils attendant thereupon. . . .

The alternative to absolute neutrality would not necessarily involve us in war. Our moral, financial and economic support of the anti-Fascist powers would most probably turn the trick without the need for full military support. But there is still a third possibility, which your last proposal suggests—war in Europe is not inevitable. And here is the crux of the matter.

Would it not be more to the point to see what foreign policy we as a nation should adopt if we wish to avert war in Europe and thereby avoid the risk of our being drawn into war? Such a policy would obviously require our cooperation with all the peace forces active in the world today. And I most emphatically do not mean to include among these the futile attempts at Fascist appeasement engineered by Mr. Chamberlain.

Peace may yet be preserved and America be kept out of war if the United States will join with all non-aggressor states in calling a halt to any and all attempts at aggression whenever and wherever they are threatened. An effective means of stopping all such present and future wars or threat of war is jointly to impose economic sanctions on the aggressor and treaty-breaking nations while rendering all necessary aid to the victim. The application of this policy in the present Sino-Japanese war would quickly bring the latter to her knees and end this reign of barbarism in the Far East.

Far from provoking war, such a policy would ensure the world against war through cutting off the credits and supplies necessary to wage a successful invasion. Most nearly coinciding with this policy is your proposal listed as No. 5. I heartily endorse this policy as a means not only of keeping this country out of war but also of ensuring the peace of Europe and the world.

ROBERT GOLDSMITH

There has been war in Europe for some time. In all cases the Fascist powers have been the aggressors. This country together with the USSR, can and should prevail upon England, France and all other non-aggressive countries, to present a world-front against any further acts of aggression wherever they may occur. This would eliminate the possibility of America being involved in war, since the aggressive powers would be confronted with a united strength that they could never attack.

MENTANA GALLEANI

Policy No. 6 was supported, among others, by Newton Arvin, Nathaniel Peffer, Joseph Hudnut, Jerome Davis and Harry Slochower. Some of their comments are as follows:

I favor policy No. 6, not stipulated or committed in advance, but only if it is the only alternative to fascist hege-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

So much depends on what happens that it is hard to say at this time that you favor a particular policy. For instance, if the country should ever give military aid I would favor doing it as listed in policy No. 6, but we would have to know clearly that Great Britain and the other countries were in fact promoting democracy and not dictatorship and imperialism. Usually situations are highly complex and Great Britain certainly has a wide variety of interests at stake in any war situation.

JEROME DAVIS

Policy No. 3 was favored by a group which included George N. Shuster, William T. Stone, Virginius Dabney and Frederic Nelson:

Since I have not believed, and do not believe, that there will be war in Europe provided Great Britain is determined to prevent absorption of small nations, I believe the time is ripe for a vigorous effort to build a real international-security system. This would at first look like giving aid to Britain, but it would in fact be lending support to small nations and therewith to the ideal of peace. I think we could have almost any solution we desire if we were to act adroitly now.

GEORGE N. SHUSTER

. . . I would favor a general cash-and-carry plan, which would, I think, permit retention of technical neutrality for a longer period after war actually breaks out. However, I would not do this "with the intention of giving more help to Britain and her allies," and I would not favor any extension of loans. As an alternative to the embargo on arms, I would favor national legislation—quite apart from the Neutrality Act—permitting control of important critical material *in the national interest*. . . .

It seems to me that policy No. 4 is disingenuous and illusory. Even if Great Britain should enter a bloc of anti-Fascist powers, she could not and would not give binding assurances that she would fight for democratic aims. She would be fighting to defend the British Empire and nothing else. If we believe that preservation of the British Empire is essential to our national interests, then we should throw our whole weight on Britain's side; if we don't, then we should not be fooled by slogans.

WILLIAM T. STONE

Policy No. 7, taken entirely alone, received two votes, those of Scott Buchanan and Paul Radin. Mr. Buchanan writes:

My assumption is that, for whatever reason or cause there may be in the historical background, Germany and her associates are acting in desperation. That demands swift and decisive action which will produce a manageable situation in international affairs. In other words, I am a disillusioned pacifist and have been that for some time.

I am in favor of war, at the present time, in the hope and expectation that at the end of it, the "civilizations" of England, France, Germany, Italy, etc., as at present constituted, will be completely destroyed.

PAUL RADIN

Policy No. 1, taken by itself, received only three votes, all of which were highly qualified. Says Quincy

I favor policy No. 1 as long as Roosevelt is in office, policy No. 2 as soon as the Republicans come in. As long as Roosevelt is in office the problem is to prevent him from committing the United States to some meaningless policy like quarantining aggressors or promoting religion, democracy and good faith among nations. He could certainly twist policies Nos. 3 to 7, inclusive, to this end; he could probably even make policy No. 2 serve this purpose. Therefore policy No. 1 would be the one best calculated to promote American interests. If, however, the Republicans came into office, they would be likely to pursue policy No. 1 successfully and actually fulfill the dreams of manifest destiny on which they embarked forty years ago. Roosevelt's preoccupation with moral issues would make him the tail to the British kite and would lead the United States to the same doom that awaits Britain. The danger of policy No. 1 under a Republican administration is that it would succeed and thus lead at some later date to a losing battle for the empire that we can now gain. The best hope for the United States is to dilute Roosevelt's humanitarianism with some imperialism which will at least hold him back a bit. Should the Republicans come in, it would be necessary to reverse the process and dilute their imperialism with some humanitarian considerations.

Jonathan Mitchell, perhaps with his tongue slightly in his cheek, says:

I favor policy No. 1 except—if I may—that I'd like to have traditional neutrality accompanied not by consistent isolation, but by hysterical bursts of isolation alternating with intense preoccupation with Europe and the Orient. The reason I'd like this is that it is what we are going to get in practice, if not law—I'll bet anyone two to one—and I am trying to train myself to be content with our common lot.

Among those who favored several policies simultaneously are Granville Hicks, Max Lerner, I. F. Stone, Upton Sinclair, Conrad Pendleton, Howard M. Corning and Selden C. Menefee. Some of their statements in whole or in part follow:

A combination of Nos. 4 and 5 comes closest to my position. I should like to see the United States take the lead in the formulation of a positive policy for peace. This should be done—and I think can be done—in such a way as to strengthen the progressives and weaken the reactionaries in the so-called democracies. How far this country commits itself must depend on what it is able to get in the way of guarantees. We ought to be willing to pay a very high price for a democratic peace, but we must be sure we are getting it. GRANVILLE HICKS

I favor unequivocal economic action by America against any aggressor nation, both to prevent war and in the event of war; and I favor the revision of our neutrality laws to that purpose. This does not and should not involve any alliances, whether with Great Britain and France or any other nation, and whether military or otherwise. My objection to alliances is based on my belief that the British and an alliance with us would serve to strengthen the hold of these minorities on the government and their control over opinion. It is based also on my belief that what motivates these governments is a fear of the loss of class power and imperialist prestige. America can have no traffic with any of these purposes. We must take economic action against those who would threaten war or go to war simply because we do not find living tolerable in a world gone fascist and a world gone war-mad. We can not carry on our humanist task in such a world. But we must act only on our own terms and in our own way. And we must act not only to stop Fascist aggression, but also to make clear to the so-called European democracies that our aid is not given to save their skins or their territory or their imperialisms, but to establish the conditions of a period of peace without aggression, during which every country will be able to work out its own inner destiny.

I believe our economic strength is so immense that it should prove adequate either to swing the balance against war or, if a war breaks out, against the aggressors in a war. But once embarked upon economic action, we must not be blind to the possibility that more will be required of us. If the values which have meaning for us are worth acting for, they are ultimately worth fighting for. My own calculation is that the odds are against the need for military action on our part. But if, despite that, the need should arise, we should not as a people flinch from the ultimate logic of our beliefs. The same democratic militancy with which the humanist forces in this country are seeking to transform our economy and make it a workable one and a decent one, must be applied to our foreign policy as well. A culture moving toward the socialization of the bases of its democracy cannot afford to be half militant and half isolationist. Otherwise it will find that while it is seeking to build its gleaming cities from within, a grave is being prepared for it from without. MAX LERNER

I favor policy No. 4, but I realize that it may have to be supplemented by 5, 6 and/or 7. It is possible to wade, but one should be prepared to swim. I am not anxious to see this country commit itself too soon or too rigidly so long as pro-Fascist elements are at the controls in England and France, and it would be a blessing if some severe shock—such as the possible loss of Russian aid—were to cause a popular revulsion that would be strong enough to blast Chamberlain and Bonnet and that man-on-donkey-back, Daladier, out of office. . . .

I wish we could be untouched by the struggle abroad, but I think the attempt at an illusory isolation can only end by leaving us dangerously *isolated*. We have been brought up in the tradition of sweet reasonableness, and our first tendency when faced by Nazi and Fascist demands is to find some reasonable explanation for them, and then to seek a means of meeting supposed grievances. We are beginning to recognize that all this talk of "national self-determination" (for Germans only, except those in the Tyrol), and "living room" and "national poverty" is—in the present political context—hooey. But we have not yet come to *act* on that recognition. Adolf Hitler is out to dominate the world, and may do so unless we recognize that security is

ACCESSED TO NNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

served by a line-up of forces so overwhelming that a German defeat is certain. War or worse will be ensured by any hint that there can be other Munichs, that democratic opinion still chooses to let Herr Devil take the hindmost. But this does not mean that I would hand a blank check signed "Uncle Sam" to the umbrella man from Birmingham.

This is not so contradictory as it may sound. One does not travel as the bird flies, by a straight line. But one also does not travel without a destination. It happens that this is the only one of the three democracies that has a true democrat in power. I think that, always keeping a cautious eye on the Bonnets in our own State Department and in our London and Paris embassies, the safest course would be to give F. D. R. enough elbow room to steer with skill and safety.

An automobile with a locked steering wheel is not the safest of vehicles. I. F. STONE

I do not believe we will ever have peace until we have an international government with full police powers and I doubt very much whether we can get that until capitalism is overthrown. It looks very much as if it was going to overthrow itself, for I do not believe the workers would stand the sufferings of a third world war, and I think they will revolt at the end of the second. UPTON SINCLAIR

In next week's issue we shall print some of the statements sent in by persons whose replies did not exactly correspond with any of our categories. Among those are John C. deWilde, Solomon F. Bloom, Lillian Hellman, John Temple Graves II, Louise Bogan, Lewis Mumford, George F. Eliot, William Carlos Williams, Erskine Caldwell, Gerald W. Johnson, Paul Weiss, John Hyde Preston and Leane Zugsmith.

Freud's "Interpretation of Dreams"

Eleventh of the "Books That Changed Our Minds"

THERE ARE intellectual discoverers whose influence is measured largely by a single postulate or theory—like Harvey with the circulation of the blood, Koch and Pasteur with the germ theory of disease, or even Newton with gravitation. But there are others who contribute not merely specific discoveries but a point of view that brings about subtle and far-reaching changes in the way people think. Of this nature was Darwin with his concept of evolution, Marx with his dynamic explanation of social change, and Freud with his view of the human personality. Regardless of the scientific testing of specific hypotheses, such illuminations furnish a general framework into which a large number of things seem to fit, a clue to hitherto unexplored regions, the sort of organic explanation of many relationships, which people see as a more consistent ordering of previous insights. These discoverers leave their traces in language, coining words and phrases that are accepted in common usage by many who have only vague ideas of the theories in which the terms originally played a part.

Innovators of this kind are likely to suffer a peculiar fate. Not only do they shock vested interests in doctrine and arouse bitter opposition but, because of the fundamental nature of their challenge, they frighten on an even wider front those who depend for security on established ideas and mores. Their influence often makes its way not so much by reasoned acceptance or rejection as by the permeation of disguised agents into the ranks of the opposition—agents in the form of ideas and methods that survive because they remain who today analyzes the contradictions of capitalism does not stop to think that these ideas stem from Marx, whose more formal constructions he vigorously rejects. And many who regard Freud as the originator of a mistaken theory would not know how to get along without the concept of unconscious motivation, or the word "complex," or the understanding of certain people's behavior in terms of father-fixation or dependence on maternal care.

Sigmund Freud, born May 6, 1856, in Moravia, was educated in Vienna, where he received his M.D. in 1881. In Brücke's physiological laboratory he engaged in extensive research on the central nervous system, later giving lectures at the University on neuropathology. In 1885 he went to Paris, where he studied under Charcot, devoting special attention to hysteria and hypnotic suggestion. Afterwards, in Vienna, he cooperated with Breuer, one of whose cases yielded the first hints that led him to abandon hypnosis and develop the psychoanalytic technique and theory. His first important publication on the subject was "The Interpretation of Dreams" (1900). In 1909 he was introduced to America through a series of lectures at Clark University, given at the invitation of President G. Stanley Hall.

Perhaps the most common error about Freud is to think of him as a philosopher who sat down in his study and wove out of his mind an intellectual system, which he set down in a book. Such books are the subject of debate, and eventually find their place in the catalogue of thought; they can be tested by the reason

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or even of Darwin—are likely to believe that when his work burst on the world some thirty years ago, it was accepted as a fad, gave us some useful hints and then retreated into its historical niche like a winter's fashion.

It is true that the new ideas he introduced were at the beginning exploited by a host of those who understood them imperfectly. Like many others, he suffered from too much popularization. The distortion of the cult wreaked its usual havoc. But Freud himself was never a system-maker or the leader of a popular movement. He was a practising physician, with a solid scientific background. The genius which gave him an extraordinary insight into the mysteries of personality was not exercised in intellectual divination or the arrangement of abstract ideas, but in dealing with individual patients in the doctor's office; what he discovered he learned from them, from the cures and failures that resulted from the treatment. Like any good scientist, he held preconceived ideas in check; as the laboratory worker looks through the microscope to see what he can find, so he looked by the various methods he devised into the minds and behavior of his patients. He has been engaged in a continual learning process; his earlier techniques and hypotheses have subsequently been modified or refined. The main body of his scientific contribution cannot be found in any single book or paper—even though such a work as "The Interpretation of Dreams" offers a suggestive introduction or his later "Autobiography" a lucid summary.[1] And it cannot be evaluated simply by common-sense criticism. It is rather open to confirmation or rejection only by competent persons who have received the arduous professional training necessary to test it by experiment in the same kind of human laboratory that supplied him with his data. For the layman to argue about the validity of psychoanalytic therapy is as fruitless as for him to attempt a critical discussion of brain surgery.

Though the original popular interest in psychoanalytic theory has abated, its contributions to science have kept on quietly expanding through the work of the ever growing number of its trained practitioners, until it has become accepted as one of the established resources of medicine. Analysts are on the teaching staffs of some of the best medical schools. General psychiatry has made use of the Freudian contribution. Today, in the United States, the recognized psychoanalyst must have his degree in general medicine from an approved school; he must have gone through a general medical interneship, a special psychiatric interneship and the training requisite for a specialist in psychiatry; and, finally, he must have been analyzed himself, must learn his art under the direction of the local Psychoanalytic Institute, and must be approved by it. It should therefore be remembered that the nucleus of what we are discussing is not a book or a system of thought but a living and changing scientific discipline that is constantly at work in the practice of medicine. And, in this sphere at least, it must be recognized that Freud's influence has become more and more solidly established, even though, like other medical innovators, he still has to encounter opposition within the profession.

What does badly need to be done, however, is to evaluate and correct the influences that have flowed out from the nub of medical theory into literature, personal standards, general scientific and social thinking.

Freud's theories, with their insights into unconscious motivation and emotional abnormalities, seemed at first to offer a large vein of new material to the creative writer, and were widely utilized both in subject matter and in method. Yet it is doubtful that their extensive influence resulted in any great enrichment of literature. The poet has his own insights into human personality, and he employed them according to his talents long before psychoanalysis was ever heard of. The literary creations best subject to psychoanalytic interpretation were written without reference to Freudian theory. They are simply the poems, plays and novels that evince the most sensitive understanding of personality and emotion. And there is every reason why this should be so. The good psychoanalyst is himself something of a poet; he knows from experience that nothing is so deadening to the appreciation of a given individuality as the crude application of some general formula that may not fit the person in question. To approach a task of artistic evocation with the scaffolding of an intellectual theory often inhibits those very insights upon which the creative success of the writer depends. The best writers in the proletarian school, no less than in the Freudian, have discovered this truth. The function, both of the writer and of the psychiatrist, is not to fit every personality to a procrustean bed of preconceived notions, but to observe, each in his own way and for his own purposes, what the personality is made of and how it behaves. Significant parallels are discovered only after the literary evidence is in.

The influence of psychoanalytic conceptions on style has been even more pervasive than their influence on matter or interpretation. There has been a marked tendency to use of words, not as clearly denotative descriptions, but as symbols or as starting points for a long train of association enriched by the unconscious. Processes of "free association" have been practised in writing, with the idea of liberating language and getting away from trite and stereotyped images. This tendency has sometimes extended to a point of complete unin-

[1] "Studies of Hysteria" (1895) first emphasized the distinction between the conscious and the unconscious mind, and the effects of unconscious emotion. "The Interpretation of Dreams" elaborated

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

praised writers, such as James Joyce or Gertrude Stein, exhaustive glossaries or interpretations are necessary before the average reader can make anything out of them. Painters and sculptors, too, have attempted to delve directly into the preconscious or even the unconscious by the use of unfamiliar symbols rather than by employing the customary methods of pictorial description. Not all the influence in these directions may be traced to Freud; there were many factors in the intellectual atmosphere that contributed to the new modes of art.

These styles are not likely to be widely imitated or to endure long. They have had their effect on others who develop in a less extreme fashion the hints provided; they have probably served a purpose in loosening, deformalizing and vivifying language. At the same time there is a reaction against them as a means of escape into "art for art's sake"—a mode of expression that has no connection with a popular audience or with social meanings. As such, they are as far as possible from the therapeutic aims of psychoanalysis itself, which investigates the unconscious, not to exploit it or to provide a way out from everyday existence, but precisely in order to neutralize its deceptions and make unnecessary false escapes from reality. Words as symbols carrying rich associations have been used by poets from time immemorial, without departure from meaning. It may be significant in this connection that Freud himself has an extraordinarily lucid and logical style; he does not even veil his meaning more than is unavoidable in the technical terms that scientists usually affect. The freedom from emotional blocks which he has achieved is devoted to releasing his rationality and persuasiveness rather than the reverse. The consequence of being a skilled psychiatrist is not to write like one of his patients.

Popular misunderstanding of psychoanalytic ideas had for a time an equally curious effect on personal conduct. Those who half understood it, from reading only, often assumed that it taught that the basis of life was untrammeled emotional impulse and that, in order to be healthy, it was necessary merely to banish every inhibition that might prevent one from doing whatever one felt like at the moment. Of course it is true that some patients suffer from repression of unconscious drives, which then manifest themselves in a deformed aspect through bodily illness or neurotic behavior, and that the task of the doctor is often to bring to consciousness the guilt or hate or fear that is troubling them in a disguised form.

But that is only half the battle; the patient then has to learn to behave like a complete and civilized being without denying the existence of his emotions—but also without expressing them in injurious or crazy ways. He has to get them in harness, using them instead of allowing them to drive him. This is an exercise in reason, morality and conscious will is a universal trait of bundle of raw and conflicting emotions is fit only for a madhouse or a prison. Freud's therapeutic technique is not to deny reason in the interest of instinctual life, but rather to strengthen reason by preventing it from being warped by unrecognized and, therefore, untamed and destructive emotion. He believes that the healthy individual must have freedom, to be sure—but not only freedom from stupid external restrictions that cramp life, but also freedom from irrational compulsions within himself. Such freedom implies organization and discipline.

The exaltation of the irrational in social or political life is likewise often unjustly attributed to the influence of Freud. His discovery of the enormous part played by the unconscious in the human mind—which is often compared to an iceberg, only one-seventh of which is seen above the surface of the water—is frequently thought to destroy the hope of rational progress, and to make necessary the treatment of human beings as if they were creatures that can be influenced only by emotional propaganda rather than by appeals to reason. It is sometimes supposed that the Fascists and the Nazis learned their cynical technique from this school of thought, or that indeed their pursuit of irrational goals is justified by the kind of animal man is. Religious moralists, particularly those of the Aristotelian or Thomist school, deplore what they believe is Freud's exaltation of the impulsive, and call for a return to reason and the acceptance of basic truths long since discovered and handed down by authority.

But in fact, if Freud's discovery is valid, the unconscious with its irrational influence was there long before he found it; he did not create it. Men were moved by emotion contrary to reason long before he was born, and Hitler and Mussolini are not the first anti-humanist leaders. The important question is whether Freud is correct, not whether one deplores the truth he found. Of course one can argue that if this sort of thing is so it is better not to know it, but one cannot argue that and still retain any respect for science or for reason itself. Indeed there lies a hope for reason in human affairs in the proper use of the discoveries Freud has made. If the unconscious *does* influence us powerfully in irrational directions, then the more we explore it—and thus make it less unconscious—the better able we are to dissolve the destructive influences of its conflicts, and gain power from its creative drives. Reason can begin to be effective in purposeful transformation of reality only when it begins to be freed from unconscious biases. And it is the function of psychoanalysis to serve just this end.

Resistance to the discovery that one is influenced by unknown and disreputable emotions as well as by rea-

INTENDED FOR UNTDOC
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

insult to the dignity of the ego. And the stronger the irrational influence, the greater, as a rule, is the resistance to acknowledging that it exists, for that resistance is the very thing that maintains the repression and keeps the emotion unconscious. It is therefore no surprise that in philosophic discussion we should find strong opposition to the idea of unconscious motivation; those who lay great stress on this point are themselves open to the suspicion of unconscious bias. It is probable that their objections may be explained on some other ground than that of pure reason. Few if any of them have taken the pains conscientiously to examine the facts that lead to acceptance of the theory; they simply reject it because they disapprove of it. Centuries of authoritative "truth," however, have not bred a race that a disinterested observer could call highly rational.

Psychoanalytic ideas have been extended also to biography, anthropology and history. The results have been suggestive, but not definitive. It is natural to suppose that whatever throws light on the behavior of known individuals will also illuminate the behavior of individuals in other places or generations, and even of groups, tribes and nations. This is undoubtedly true. Yet no good doctor makes a confident diagnosis of a patient whom he can actually see and study, without a careful examination; even then he may be wrong. Long-distance diagnosis is therefore perilous. And if we cannot be sure about the sources of behavior even of a single person concerning whom a good many facts are not recorded, how much less can we infer with any certainty what really determines the action of a group or society which, though as a whole it may conform to certain observed patterns, still consists of personalities as yet unexplored.

When psychoanalysts themselves write concerning subjects outside their own practice, it is not always clear just when they depart from scientific assurance and advance mere guesses or hypotheses. This confuses the reader, and makes him suspect that the ability of psychoanalysis to throw light on non-medical subjects has been overemphasized. It should be accepted as a premise that psychological work in these non-medical fields is still in a pioneer stage, and what is written about it must necessarily be tentative. Once that warning is laid down, however, there can be no doubt that modern psychology has much to offer; indeed the social disciplines could hardly make further progress without it. The moment they branch out from pure description to any sort of theoretical formulation, they necessarily make assumptions about human character and motivation. The psychological assumptions that are likely to be accepted by one who knows nothing about the structure of the personality beyond the uncritical ideas of the layman are likely to be inferior to those of one

In this respect the common objection that the doctors deal only with abnormalities does not carry much weight. There is no sharp dividing line between the normal and the abnormal, but rather a continuous gradation, and it is impossible to understand either without knowing a good deal about the other. To say that a psychiatrist is incapable of accounting for healthy behavior because his function is curing the sick is like saying that a physician who deals primarily with bodily illness therefore cannot understand the ordinary facts of anatomy and the processes of physiology.

Perhaps the greatest resistance to understanding of psychoanalysis comes, not from the moralists, but from the tradition of thought which is crudely materialistic and insists on tracing every phenomenon to a purely physical cause. By those accustomed to think in this way, it is supposed that Freud set out to deal with the "psyche" as opposed to the body and that hence there must be an element of unscientific mysticism in his method. Pavlov, as a physiologist, is approved because he modified animal behavior by external conditioning, whereas Freud is regarded askance because his treatment consists so largely of examination and rearrangement of ideas and emotions. Yet many of Freud's cases —including early ones—were people who were obviously physically ill. The better scientific theory of today regards as false the theoretical separation between material and mental. The human body is a living organism which is in itself neither wholly physical nor wholly mental, but both. Its behavior has both aspects at once; the reality behind them is unitary. The discipline of the psychiatrist and that of the physiologist are not separate divisions of subject matter; they are merely different avenues by which identical phenomena may be approached.

It is clear, for instance, that Freud's theories about character formation in the child depend, not merely on his discoveries of the way in which the mind works, but on the kind of conditioning that the child receives from his environment—a conditioning which is no less and no more physical than the environments which Pavlov created for his dogs. The "conditioned reflex" fits perfectly into psychoanalytic theory, for without it there would be no understanding of the behavior trait by which persons early habituated to respond in a certain way to certain stimuli often continue to do so after any rational cause for the response is gone. And this trait is at the very bottom of many neuroses.

Psychiatric treatment has sometimes been most successful in cases of what has customarily been regarded as purely physical disease—for instance, heart trouble, digestive disturbances, allergies and skin lesions. This is true, not merely when the ailment in question is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

physical tests. On the other hand, physical therapy, such as insulin or metrazol shock, is having amazing success in relieving the symptoms of what used to be regarded as purely mental disease, such as schizophrenia—a disorder that resists psychoanalysis when far advanced. The result of such recent discoveries is the establishment of a new frontier of medicine in which the psychiatrist and the other medical specialists are beginning to work together both in research and in therapy. The good psychiatrist is always alert for physical symptoms in what used to be called "mental" disease, while the other medical specialists are gradually learning that many, if not most "physical" diseases have important emotional components, and that it is the whole patient that must be treated rather than just the symptom.

A similar unnecessary opposition has existed in social thinking. It has been supposed by some that psychoanalysis deals entirely with the individual and attributes all the ills of the world to personal abnormalities and mistakes, whereas social difficulties really arise mainly from environmental causes and can be remedied only by social or political action. The psychoanalyst, it is thought, believes simply in adjusting the individual to his environment, whereas the greater necessity is to adjust the environment to individuals. It is true, of course, that the doctor's main business is treating single patients, and since it is impossible for him to remake the whole social order overnight, a large part of his task must be assisting the individual to achieve greater health within civilization as it exists. But it is not true that psychoanalytic theory leads to the conclusion that social change is undesirable or that anyone who believes in it is abnormal. Indeed, some of the most abnormal persons are the stubbornly conservative. It is a sign of neurotic character to be unwilling to change an environment when it is reasonable to do so for purposes of survival or health.

Much of the psychiatrist's repair work might be avoided in a social order that was modified in respect of family institutions, education and organization of adult life; it ought to be possible to derive from psychiatric knowledge extremely valuable conclusions concerning the kind of modifications that should be made, as well as techniques for achieving them. Just as individuals would be inconceivable without external relationships, so social problems cannot really be understood without accurate knowledge of the way in which individuals behave in relation to each other and to groups. To conceive of watertight compartments between the individual and society is as erroneous as to separate in a similar manner the body and the mind. The real distinction lies not so much in the subject matter as in the angle of approach. Cross-fertilization between the two ways of studying human behavior—the psychological and the social—is still in its infancy, but we already know enough to suspect that here lies the next great hope for the advancement of science in the study of mankind.

GEORGE SOULE

Looking at 1940

THIS COUNTRY has always been politically minded, and is getting more so. With the national conventions of the political parties still a year away, speculation on possible candidates fills columns daily in the newspapers. Mr. Garner among the Democrats and Mr. Vandenberg among the Republicans are already working for the nomination about as strongly as anyone can, and half a dozen others are edging into the limelight, especially District Attorney Dewey and Senator Taft. Secretary Ickes and a host of people are urging that President Roosevelt break the third-term tradition by seeking the nomination for himself. It is far too early to make predictions as to what will happen in June and November of next year. It is not too early, though, to state some of the problems and indicate the course of events, given certain preliminary conditions.

The first of these preliminary conditions is war or peace in Europe. If the Continent goes up in flames within the next few months, and if America has been

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions, the argument in favor of keeping Mr. Roosevelt in office for another term will in my judgment be almost irresistible. If, however, the United States is not a participant by June, 1940, either because the war has not yet begun or for any other reason, much will depend upon the President's attitude between now and then. If the polls of the Institute of Public Opinion are reliable, this country is still overwhelmingly opposed to active participation in another European conflict. President Roosevelt is supported in his foreign policy only in so far as the people believe we can give moral support to "the democracies" and perhaps aid them with goods, without ourselves declaring war and sending our soldiers to fight. If during the next twelve months the country became convinced that the President's actions are reckless and irresponsible and that the danger of being drawn into conflict is greater than has been supposed, this would tell heavily against either Mr. Roosevelt himself or any other New Deal candidate, since it would be difficult for such a candidate

tic ideas but repudiating the heart of his foreign policy.

Assuming there is no war, what happens then? The first question is whether, in the absence of such a crisis as war, Mr. Roosevelt will be a candidate to succeed himself. We shall get no light on this matter from the President in the near future, and least of all if his decision is in the negative. A President who announces he will not again be a candidate instantly loses nine-tenths of his political power and all of his significance. He is like a man under sentence of death from his doctor. His friends may still care for him but they will no longer make plans to which he is a party. The people who are clamoring for the President to speak out are nearly all his enemies who are deliberately giving him bad advice in the remote hope he will be stupid enough to take it.

It is my guess, based on no inside information whatever, that Mr. Roosevelt doesn't yet know what he intends to do. Much depends on how the people really feel about the third-term issue, as to which there is little reliable evidence now in hand. Such evidence will not be obtained on jaunts across the country whether undertaken by Mr. Farley or the President. People making such trips reverse the old saw: they are listeners who never hear anything but good of themselves. Americans are too tender-hearted to tell a candidate face to face that he is sunk, or a President that the nation will not tolerate another four years of him.

Another important factor in the President's decision is what the Tory Democrats will do. The kind of Democratic politician for whom Vice President Garner is just now the figurehead hates the New Deal far more than he does anything the Republicans could possibly do and would therefore prefer a GOP victory to another four years of FDR or anyone like him. The embattled Democans are already talking about marching out of the Democratic convention in a body if the New Dealers name the next candidate. They would either have a rump convention and a new party of their own, or they would join forces with the Republicans. If they formed a separate party, it would of course fail miserably in the election. When the country wants a conservative President, as Robert H. Jackson said the other day, it goes to the Republicans, who can deliver the simon-pure guaranteed product. If the leaders should join forces with the Republicans, many of their rank and file would in disgust stay home on election day. Either course of action would much increase the probability of a Republican victory in November.

Suppose, however, that Mr. Garner and his friends should capture the Democratic National Convention—it is not impossible—and name, not the Texan himself, who will be approaching seventy-three when the next President is inaugurated, but some younger replica, and form a third party. Its candidate would certainly be Mr. Roosevelt himself, and it would offer the strongest opposition to the other two parties ever seen in American history. With the new party would go nearly all the nation's progressives, whatever their nominal allegiance; hundreds of thousands of persons on relief or farmers who have benefited from successive forms of the AAA and fear the discontinuance of the help they have received; most of the liberal-minded Republicans who could no longer stomach their party if it were openly the vehicle of reaction; many thousands of rank-and-file Democrats who have no great liberal leanings but would argue that the President was better entitled to be called the Democratic nominee than the Garnerite who wore the title and, finally, millions of independent American voters of no particular political affiliation who like the President as a personality, because of what they have seen of him in the newsreels and heard on the radio. No doubt these individuals are fewer than they were in 1936 but they are still a mighty army.

The Tory Democrats cannot win under any circumstances. On a basis of the present situation, it is hard to see how the New Dealers can win with any candidate except Mr. Roosevelt. No other man who has been suggested as their standard-bearer possesses a tenth of his attractiveness. Some of those most eligible are little known. Secretary Hull may be ruled out of this discussion both because of his age and because he is not really a New Dealer. Mr. Farley is a Catholic and Al Smith showed us in 1928 that no member of that Church can be elected President of the United States in this generation. Moreover, Farley is a politician, painfully ill equipped for the high office to which he undoubtedly aspires; and he, too, is not a New Dealer at heart but one who has gone along with the President, often reluctantly, out of personal loyalty to the Chief. If the Democrats should decide to throw away the election by nominating a member of the Catholic Church, they might as well give the empty compliment of the nomination to Attorney General Frank Murphy, a loyal New Dealer and one of the most brilliant men in the country.

Assuming all the breaks in Mr. Roosevelt's favor, assuming that he is renominated, that the Tories in his party do not bolt and that the third-term issue proves less serious than people fear, can he be reëlected? If it is impossible to answer that question with an easy "No," it is equally impossible to give a decisive "Yes." All the available evidence indicates that the trend towards conservatism which appeared so emphatically in the congressional elections last year has widened and deepened since then. Mr. Roosevelt is still the most popular figure in American public life. The index of the Institute of Public Opinion still gives him more than 50 percent of the allegiance of the voters—

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cate that in an election held today he would be defeated by District Attorney Dewey and would only run even with Senator Taft.

The renewal of the depression is of course an important factor in the situation. Ten years after the depression began and six years from the first Roosevelt inaugural, we still have ten or eleven million unemployed and a general business index in the neighborhood of ninety. We can no longer say that the United States is merely sharing in a worldwide depression; the figures of the League of Nations show that nearly every other industrial country in the world is doing better than we, some of them tremendously better. It is no effective answer to observe that the alternatives proposed by the Republicans and by big business are fallacious; the country does not want any administration to prove the other fellow is wrong but that its own plans are right.

It is illuminating to see the reasons for which the Roosevelt administration is condemned by its foes, as listed by the Institute of Public Opinion. The administration of relief was blamed by 23 percent, the spending policy by 16 and efforts on behalf of the farmer by 12. The foreign policy and the attitude toward labor were each criticized by 6 percent. People on relief complained of the farm program and farmers complained of relief, spending and—11 percent of them—the farm program.

No one need be surprised to learn that those praising the Roosevelt administration presented the reverse of the medal. The relief program came first, being favored by 28 percent. The banking measures got the support of 21, the CCC camps 11, social security 7 and the farm program 5. The explanation of this seeming paradox is simple. People are not very logical in political affairs—or in any other. They think with their emotions, and the same developments which seem abhorrent from one point of view seem desirable from the opposite one.

Many American progressives are reluctant to face the possibility that they must choose between a third term for Mr. Roosevelt and a practically certain victory for the Republicans. While they do not share the theory that whatever the Founding Fathers felt about a third term must be conclusive (they were far less positive than is commonly supposed), these progressives are nevertheless disturbed by the tendency in American political life that three successive full terms of four years would imply. Yet they are equally reluctant to see the conservatives return to power. They do not expect that if this happened many of the New Deal measures would be repealed; in fact, they take it for granted that social security would go on, large-scale spending would continue for years to come and the national budget would probably remain unbalanced. What they fear is that we should stop where we are—with reforms left in a rudimentary stage or not undertaken at all.

It is clearly high time that the New Dealers get down to business, if they do not want to see a Tory Republican in the White House on January 20, 1941. While the drift of the country toward a conservative position has been much exaggerated in that portion of the press which welcomes such a movement, there is no doubt that it is under way. The New Deal principles must be sold to the nation all over again; the New Deal practices must be defended when they are defensible and when they are not, evils must be admitted and ended.

Looking back over the past six years, it is easy to see that the New Dealers talked too much and did too little. They frightened thousands of timid citizens by exuberant language that they themselves only halfway meant, while they were too ready in fact to accept compromises with the existing order in cases where half a loaf was certainly worse than no bread. Those in control persisted in looking on certain problems as being of a temporary and emergency character when it was painfully evident to nearly everyone else that they were here to stay for many years unless heroic measures were taken. There has been far too great a tendency to keep eyes fixed on the stock market and as soon as the averages went up a few points, to assume that the battle was now practically over and that the economizers could have their turn.

The New Dealers need to sit down and take stock of themselves, in the light of the very real danger that the sands are running out for them. What they need is a comprehensive plan for the future of the country, based upon a recognition of present realities and future possibilities, including in particular political possibilities in a country like this. (I of course don't mean to suggest that they should take no action between now and the elections; there is urgent need for immediate efforts to get the country back on its feet.) They need to stop talking in clichés which unnecessarily frighten the average citizen, and to appeal instead to the concrete opportunities for a nation which both in present plant and in natural resources is probably the richest in the world. Having made up their own minds what they want to do, they must labor mightily between now and November, 1940, to sell their program to the country. Up to now they have done a bad job in reporting on their own accomplishments, though the fault for this must be laid partly upon the hostility of most newspapers, radio systems and other media for disseminating ideas. Nevertheless, the New Deal has a fine story of achievement and there is no reason why it should not be told. It can have a magnificent proposal for the future, if it will. If it does not achieve something at least in both these directions, it will not win. And perhaps it won't deserve to.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not in the Cables

1. China Coöperates

THE LATEST NEWS about the Chinese Industrial Coöperatives is that they are at last being actively pushed in the regions held by the former Communist armies. "Guerilla industries" will be joined to guerilla warfare. Until recent weeks little or nothing had been done to start coöperatives either in the Eighth Route Army area or in that of the New Fourth Army, although the need for them is most urgent, to take care of refugees, to make supplies for the soldiers and to keep the people from having to buy Japanese goods. Reactionary business elements close to the Chungking government have not been anxious to see the coöperatives spread, and least of all in places where Communists are winning over the people.

Meanwhile, in less than nine months the coöperatives seem to have proved their case. They got started in August. By January 1, there were 170 in operation. By May 1, there were 500, and new ones are springing up so fast that there may be 1,000 by this time. With an average of fifty workers each, they are putting to work war refugees from the industrial cities and turning out an amazing variety of goods, mostly for local use but also for the army—from toothbrushes and matches to boats and submachine guns. The government has thus far lent about two million dollars (Chinese). Several coöperatives have already been able to pay back what they borrowed. Cantonese bankers have lent $200,000 and overseas Chinese and foreign friends, especially in the Philippines, have been generous with gifts. The goal, as seen by Rewi Alley, the able New Zealander who is bearing the brunt of organization, is 30,000 coöperatives, "a chain of small industry to reach from Inner Mongolia to the Eastern Sea."

The National Production Conference, meeting under the government wing at Chungking on May 14, passed a series of resolutions providing for:

1. Plans for the development and promotion of small industries.

2. The construction of light railways throughout the Chinese-controlled area.

3. The enlistment and transfer of skilled workers from Japanese-occupied territory to Sino-controlled areas northwest and southwest of Chungking.

4. *The development, growth and continuation of coöperatives and other small industries in guerilla territory in order to assist the guerillas in resisting Japan.*

Chiang Kai-shek said, in speaking at the closing session, "The conference should be considered as important as a military conference." And well he might. The Chinese government was actually waging war on Han Ying until after Shanghai had been lost. Now Han Ying's New Fourth Army has in its area in Anhwei ning to get funds to start factories. Not so long ago Chu Teh's soldiers were wearing uniforms made of Japanese cloth and sleeping in winter cold under cotton blankets made in India. Now Chinese wool and cotton are being spun and woven for them by refugee workers.

The coöperatives, once they are set going, are self-managing and self-supporting, and they are beginning to be indeed a chain—one coöperating with another. In the northwest, for example, there are two transportation coöperatives, handling goods in mule carts rigged with automobile wheels. A few units have secretly been started even behind the Japanese lines.

This coöperative movement is perhaps the most important thing that has happened in China since the war began. Without doubt it will far outlast the war, providing the economic base for reconstruction and for permanent village industries. For it fits not only the emergency wartime needs; it fits also the terrain of the country and the spirit and skill of the people.

RICHARD J. WALSH

2. Revolt in the Desert

UNDER THE TITLE "Epilogue to a Rebellion," the French semi-official daily Le Temps, in its issue of May 24, prints a story that speaks volumes about the conditions in the colonies owned by France and Italy and the relations between these two powers before and after Hitler's seizure of Czecho-Slovakia. It seems that on December 27, 1935, an Italian detachment of native Tuareg troops, stationed near the Algerian border of Libya, received an order to leave for Ethiopia. The soldiers had recently been subjected to severe flogging for minor breaches of discipline (from 100 to 150 lashes), their pay was several weeks in arrears and they did not like the prospect of fighting fellow Moslems. At midnight they killed their commanding officer, Lieutenant Ottorino Biondo, by firing a salvo into his tent, and fled to French territory. There they were arrested by the French military commander, who singled out one of them, El Bedoui, as the chief culprit and had him transferred to Constantine. That, of course, was long before the war crisis.

El Bedoui was tried three years later—colonial justice never is in a hurry—on December 22, 1938, and sentenced to death by the local jury. The supreme court, however, ordered a retrial, which took place at Algiers on May 22, 1939—after Hitler seized Prague. The trial revealed that El Bedoui was innocent. The defense stressed the atrocious measures of repression taken by the Italians at the time of the incident. The verdict of not guilty was greeted with tremendous applause. "El Bedoui," says Le Temps, "realizing the meaning of the verdict, gave up the attitude of fatalistic calm that he had maintained during the proceedings, and, raising his right arm, cried out: 'Long Live France! May God but France above everything in the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Shoot the Works

Up Pops the Wizard

THE KLAN has conjured up another Imperial Wizard. His name is James Arnold Colescott and he used to be a horse doctor in Terre Haute, Indiana. On his last birthday Dr. Colescott was forty-two years of age and he wears spectacles on account of defective vision.

Although the Doctor is bald, there is no truth in the report that by a judicious use of sunburn lotion he has managed to burn a fiery cross upon his dome.

Dr. Hiram Wesley Evans, who has done the wizarding up to now, hands over his wand with a fair amount of grace. "I didn't retire. I didn't resign," he said. "I merely did not offer myself for reëlection."

Under the hood it has been whispered that the former wizard was beginning to slip. When he put his hand into a high hat it brought forth neither rabbits nor the flags of all nations. Nor was it possible for him to reach into empty air and palm dues out of the ambient. The new witch doctor is said to be more active in mind and spirit. He moves with confidence from glanders to goblins. He purposes to "mop up alien influences in this country." And to inquiring reporters he said, "The fiery cross will again blaze on the hilltops of America."

The Imperial Wizard failed to state just what he means to use for fuel, but in some respects he was articulate. "I consider Jews a minority group," said the Witch Doctor. "If they have a problem, it is the undoubted result of their failure to adapt themselves wholeheartedly to our ideas and principles." But the professor of sleight-of-hand seems to forget that he, as well, represents a very tiny fragment of the American people.

And from this new Wizard quite obviously new magic is expected. Membership has vastly diminished. The nightshirt line has languished. No longer is the Klan a power in our politics. Unfortunately it is true that this does not necessarily represent a growth in tolerance. It may merely mean that competition has increased in the matter of selling prejudice. There may be fewer members but there are more Wizards, Dragons and Grand Exalted Demagogues than ever before. After all, what chance has a veterinarian against a major general? Too many cooks around a cauldron can spoil the witches' broth.

But even a conjuror without portfolio manages to assume that smug confidence which one associates with workers of magic. It isn't the tricks so much as the patter which puts over the act. Every prestidigitator will break the same pattern. Any sign of alarm or timidity will break the spell. There can be no such thing as a humble wizard. Accordingly when one quits curing horses in order to save the nation with a few passes and incantations he must leave behind him in his reception room the first person singular. No wizard works wholly on his own. His feats of legerdemain are accomplished through the coöperation of sprites and elves and familiar demons. An Imperial Wizard falls as readily into the use of "we" as any editorial writer. He

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The bones of the immigrant serve as ballast for the road-

the social usefulness of all publicists who undertake to cover too much territory. Every columnist gets on occasion that missive from a friend in which all the "I"s are ringed in red. And this demonstration of addiction to use of the first person perpendicular is supposed to cause the writing wretch to hang his head in shame and to resolve to be better and more impersonal in future. Fortunately most columnists are completely encased in callouses and they continue to go on with "me" and "mine" as usual. There is health in this practice. Humility rests in appreciating the fact that your opinion is that of one man and that no single person is competent to speak for the entire nation.

In the days when Dr. J. A. Colescott approached a horse and asked him to say "ah" he ventured no opinion save that which was based upon his factual findings in the horse's mouth. And even after a thorough examination he hesitated to render more than a personal opinion. "What ails him, Jim?" or maybe "Doc," the anxious owner would inquire. And after proper hesitation the kindly veterinarian would answer, "Sam, I'm pretty sure it's his tonsils. I kinda think he ought to have them out. And if that doesn't do him any good of course we can try something else. But after all it's for you to decide. It's your horse."

Yet strangely enough a simple-minded man who moved softly through the stables saying "perhaps" more frequently than "yea" or "nay" proceeds to acquire delusions of grandeur the moment he becomes a wizard. The very person who was content to admit the mystery of equine personality speaks without any doubt whatsoever about the state of the nation.

Rather graciously the Wizard stated to reporters, "We won't use physical force against the aliens, but will use civil law, courts and juries." Of course, this is very kind of the vet from Terre Haute, but I wonder whether he has ever stopped to think that possibly all these institutions established by the Constitution of the United States were functioning pretty well on their own before he laid down his stethoscope and currycomb to become the personal administrator of even-handed justice.

If this conjuror is even half the magic man he pretends to be I will not deny the possibility that he may turn carrot snips into goldfish and swallow them as well. Out of nothing but atmosphere he can fashion paper hats. Of that I have no doubt whatsoever. With hammer and chisel he may smash my dollar watch to atoms and then through the use of some formulated phrase make it as good as new and put it back into my pocket.

But let the Wizard mind his step. Neither he nor any other gifted Klansman is competent to take the Bill of Rights and pound it into fragments and then with a wave of the hand make it whole again. Once it has been utterly smashed there is nothing in the cabinet of Dr. Colescott to bring back the pulse. And though he may be able to make party caps from air, it is not within his power to create and fashion "the American way." This is a mode of life which has been a long time in the making and the job is not yet complete. The Wizard speaks of warring upon aliens and seems to forget that the men and women from many lands had their share in the creation of "the American way."

girders of our tallest towers. The blood and sweat and sinew of the stranger hold native brick into solid walls.

And in all this no wizard had any hand whatsoever. It was not black magic but merely the dreams and the hopes and the aspirations of all the world which fused into the making of America. It was not magic. It was something more. Even the Imperial Wizard should fall to his knees and humble himself before this mighty achievement. It is not magic. It is a miracle.

Look well at your wand, oh Imperial Wizard of the Ku Klux Klan. That is no symbol of enchantment but merely a broken reed. Here's your hat, doctor. Your horse has a bad cough and he's been trying to get you on the telephone from Terre Haute. HEYWOOD BROUN

Washington Notes

The Third Term

MR. ROOSEVELT has many times talked over the future with his advisers. As far as I know, he has never as much as hinted that he wanted a third term. But he has expressed a deep conviction that the New Deal crusade must go on, that the nation must not be surrendered to the reactionaries. Because he is politically the strongest of the New Deal group, it has been suspected that he is beginning to think of himself as a third-term President.

There is evidence that this rumor has fascinated and distressed many liberals. They would like to see Mr. Roosevelt in the White House for another four—or forty—years, if it could be accomplished by some sort of miraculous intervention. But for him to want a third term, to contrive and scheme for it, seems wrong. Since 1932, Mr. Roosevelt has been a lay preacher, telling his countrymen of their duties towards their fellow citizens, and has been accepted as a moral leader. For a large section of liberals, a report that he may seek a third term would be much like news that Mahatma Gandhi had turned to beer and bratwurst.

The truth is, in my opinion, that no moral judgments can be passed on presidential candidates. From Mr. Roosevelt down to the lowliest aspirant—for example, High Commissioner Paul V. McNutt—none of them has, or can have, personal volition. The presidency is like nothing else in the country. It is impossible to observe it at close range, and not feel the emotional force that resides in it. It is expressed in countless symbols. Take, for example, the familiar fact that all railroad switches are spiked before a presidential train crosses them. In this country, the only other things of which we take such minute, ceremonial care are the altars of our churches.

In the presidency, you have a compulsive force before which men can no longer act as they please. You may recall that incredibly wise biologist, Dr. Jacques Loeb, and his tropisms. Among many other things, he studied why bugs fly toward electric lights. He found it had nothing to do with vanity, egoism or ambition. The muscles of their wings were affected by light rays, and they had no choice. Dr.

How much free choice can Mr. Roosevelt exercise? If it were possible for him to hand on his program to a New Deal deputy—for instance, Secretary Hopkins—there is no doubt that he would gleefully return to Hyde Park. In this case, he would not be abandoning the presidency. He would still be the national leader, a sort of President-emeritus. But he will not, and cannot, let the presidency be snatched away from him by an outsider. His vitals would twist within him.

The present rumors of a third term for Mr. Roosevelt are unrelated to his private hopes or ambitions. They are a consequence of the Garner campaign. Not long ago, Mr. Emil Hurja, paper-work man for Mr. Farley in four campaigns, prophesied off-handedly that Mr. Garner would capture the Democratic nomination. He pointed out that, at least in recent times, no candidate as far in front of the field as Mr. Garner has ever been stopped. A smart politician will never oppose his party's leading candidate; in most cases he will jump for the flying bandwagon. The two-thirds rule that governed previous Democratic conventions was revoked in 1936. The 1940 Democratic nominee will need only about six hundred votes, and Mr. Garner's supporters now claim about three hundred. Mr. Garner had to be opposed by the New Deal's most formidable candidate.

Every occupant of the White House has complained of loneliness. No one can be with Mr. Roosevelt—certainly not his intimates—and forget that he is the nation's head. The dreadful, apparent fact is that Mr. Roosevelt can't either. A dark, formless incubus crouches on his shoulders, and he must do its bidding. We have just spoken of Dr. Loeb, who saw all animals, including men, as ambulatory chemical solutions. You will also remember the introduction to "The Golden Bough," where the priest of Nemi, naked sword in hand, ceaselessly patrolled the ground beneath his solitary oak. If it is possible to obtain the 1940 nomination for a Roosevelt deputy, Mr. Roosevelt will not run. But it is reasonably clear that, besides Mr. Hopkins, only Attorney General Murphy is acceptable; Mr. Roosevelt shows no sign of endorsing the other Cabinet candidates, Secretaries Hull and Wallace and Postmaster General Farley. Otherwise, Mr. Roosevelt will campaign in his own behalf, and win.

Conservatives are trying to kill the Mead banking measure by decrying its effectiveness. The bill provides for government insurance, after the manner of the FHA, of 90 percent of loans to small business men; the banks themselves assume the risk of the first 10 percent. Opponents point out that the small-business loans the banks now hesitate to make would not, in most cases, result in more than a 10-percent loss. If the Mead bill were enacted, they would be just as reluctant to lend as they are now.

New Deal experts hope that the conservatives are overreaching themselves. What the conservatives are saying is that, in the present circumstances, the banks cannot fulfill their proper functions, even with government assistance. New Dealers hope to use the conservatives' own words to support a far more drastic proposal, the establishment of a chain of government-owned banks for intermediate and long-term credit. Publicly New Dealers deny that such a banking chain would compete with privately owned banks

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hearings of the monopoly committee, when they are resumed, will reveal what amounts to local monopolies of investment credit in many parts of the country. A government banking chain would be a useful instrument in fighting this.

The record of the recently ended session of the Pennsylvania legislature is worth notice. The Republican majority disemboweled the state's "Little Wagner Act," passed under Governor Earle. Labor unions are now gagged and bound under heavy legal restrictions. Possibly Governor James will not be the Republican candidate next year, but his backers, the Pews and Annenbergs, will be the fattest contributors to the Republican campaign funds. On whomever is chosen, Mr. Dewey, Mr. Taft or Mr. Vandenberg, they will hold a first lien. The fate of the New Deal's social program, with a Republican victory, can be read in what has just happened at Harrisburg.

Washington T. R. B.

Other People's Money

Victory for the SEC

A LONG STEP toward the winning of an old battle has been taken by the Securities and Exchange Commission. It has ordered the Stock Exchange to put into effect by July 1 a rule prohibiting members of the Exchange who act as brokers from buying securities on margin. The Exchange has been fiddling with the reform for some time. A proposal had been made that brokers be permitted to hold share interests in corporations which trade on margin. In other words, while the broker himself would not openly and frankly trade on margin, he could own or control a corporate affiliate which would do this for him. The SEC refused to permit any such bald subterfuge and has directed the no-margin broker rule to be made effective in a few weeks.

This is the most important reform that can be effected in the security markets. The root of most of the evils of the security markets has been the practice of brokers operating as stock gamblers. All brokers do not do this, to be sure. Some of the most reputable houses frown on it. There are many men in the Exchange who are aware of the bad consequences resulting from this. But unfortunately the larger number of members of the Exchange gain their riches either as floor traders, specialists or speculators. This rule will drive the broker out of this practice.

There remains the problem of the specialist. The specialist is a broker who trades for his own account. The Exchange has a collection of arguments which it has always used to defend this position. But it is indefensible.

When this has been solved there will remain the floor trader himself, who should not be permitted to do business on the floor of the Exchange. Perhaps the mood of reform in the country has dissolved so extensively that it may not be possible to get around to this one on this trip. It could

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mission did not come into good hands until Douglas became its chairman. Whatever it has accomplished has been done since then.

One of the salutary features of the depression was the influence it had upon the minds of the gentlemen who pick the candidates for honorary degrees in American colleges. The long procession of bankers and brokers and "success heroes" who moved across the commencement stages to be honored and held up before the students as models, gave way to a different kind of person. Scholars and scientists and men who had performed great public services were chosen instead. But I think I perceive now, as I scan the daily list of gentlemen being made Doctors of Laws and Doctors of Letters, another sign that the period of mourning and repentance is passing. Last year Princeton chose Governor Harry Moore, the henchman of Frank Hague, in the very midst of Hague's disgraceful performances, as worthy of a doctor's degree from that great old institution. And this year I notice with a mixture of amusement and sadness that New York University conferred a Doctor-of-Laws degree upon Grover Whalen. What Mr. Whalen has done to deserve this I could not make out from the award. Mr. Whalen was the private secretary of a Tammany Mayor, a Tammany commissioner and later Jimmy Walker's Police Commissioner who distinguished himself by his Gilbertian war on the reds. He was for a brief time the manager of a department store and until recently the head of a whiskey-manufacturing concern. Aside from this he had a more or less comic career as the official greeter for a Tammany Mayor. He is now singled out among America's citizens for the high scholastic honor of Doctor of Laws.

In the West recently I was informed that the City of Milwaukee has done a rather astonishing thing. As I heard it, Milwaukee back around 1924 decided to pay off its debt. While other cities were borrowing, it started a savings account to pay its outstanding obligations. Now the fund has swelled to the point where in another few years—not more than five—it will be sufficient to pay off its entire balance of debt. This experience is apt to create a false hope in the breasts of those who are worrying about our immense national debt. If Milwaukee can do this, they argue, why cannot other cities do the same thing? I am not familiar with all of the data in connection with Milwaukee's experience with debt and depression. But I do know that if all American cities and states were to attempt to pay off their debts in the next fifteen years the result would be national bankruptcy. The creation of debts always produces economic stimulation. The payment of them has the opposite effect. To some this may sound like an argument against paying one's debts. Of course it is not. The individual cannot afford as a practical business policy to refuse to pay his debts. Neither can states and cities. To do so is to ruin their credit. But if they all pay their debts they ruin the economic system. Public debts as a whole are never paid. Ways are found to repudiate them. And this is what will happen in good time to much if not most of the public debts of America. And hence while Milwaukee's example—Milwaukee with its Socialist mayor—may gladden the heart of the

The Caravan (II) and Abe

To finish up with the Ballet Caravan: I suppose a developed taste and acceptance would smoothh over the undeniable ugliness of certain traditional ballet *pas*, just as the goose-step would become the higher beauty to a Prussian staff officer. Certainly a few doses of the flatfoot "esthetic" dancers should demonstrate the superiority of a disciplined framework, and that the featuring of a big toe the size of a cucumber is a necessary concession to the effect of speed and light. But a ballet troupe is something like an orchestra, which must be composed for and directed, whereas our general education—scattered ballet effects in vaudeville, Broadway musicals, movies and the stages of film palaces—has been largely fed on an unhinged virtuosity, the candy-box tableau, the strenuous tumbling act, the dog on its hind legs.

And this does not hold simply for the dumb masses: go to the most cultural recital and watch how any dancer who comes front and center for a difficult routine brings down the house and also the main effect, if any. Music audiences, unaware as they often are, do not go banging their foolish hands over some triumph of fingering in the middle of a fugue; even theatre audiences, which are, God knows, bad enough, hold their noise for entrances and exits. The dance audience honestly takes its entertainment like a ball game, rooting and tooting as though each close play were a complete thing in itself. And this is partly the fault of dancers, who may have been arty as anything but who have too generally treated their art as a bag of tricks. And when art becomes a medicine-man show it sacrifices the broad base of common acceptance and delight for a stringy offensive cultism or the qualities of the circus, with which it cannot compete.

And now if dancing as a well founded art is to survive among us, I think it has to go the Ballet Caravan way. It must be more close to us, more an expression of what we know and feel. It should be more deeply serious and less pretentious, also it could be a lot more humorous and actually look less funny. It can learn its easiest inflection only if it goes to the country, through all the arts of the theatre. Dancing is really far behind the country. If it is musical "expression" the dance is after, it seems to ignore that we have music of a kind, with such high successes in its cross-rhythms and easy colloquial speech as Fred Astaire, who is known to millions, and the double line of dancers who come flying intricately across each other and the stage in "The Hot Mikado." So far, except among Negroes, dancing as an intense sort of counterpoint to the moods of the music as played has become artificial and remote. If it is a trained all-around precision of ensemble response, dancers act as though they'd never heard of the Rockettes or the day-in-day-out capacities of the Gae Foster girls. If it is comment on something or other, they never betray any appreciation of the way the Hartmanns started straight and then became an institution by pushing that over the edge into sly exaggeration. None of these people or the things they do should be merely copied, of course. It is simply that their success should be a constant reminder of the standing are an expression of the country's best life that

"Young Mr. Lincoln" is another of the strangely honest movies that this year has produced, without producing much else: most of them have been unspectacular, though two have had real brilliance ("Wuthering Heights" and "Nazi Spy"). This one is good but, opening without expense or explosion, it may slip past all but its audiences without much notice. Outside of being better constructed than the year's Lincoln play, and less dependent on the business of make-up and excerpted speeches, it requires no comparison. It starts with Lincoln in his home town, not sure of what he would do but already attracted to book learning and politics. It hangs most of the action around an early law case and the general life of fair-day in a frontier town—referring back lightly to Nancy Hanks and Ann Rutledge, suggesting the future parts of Stephen Douglas and Mary Todd—and just about leaves it at that. I couldn't say whether this is the historical spit and image of Nancy's boy Abe, but it looks pretty likely and it looks pretty good.

John Ford deliberately used a slow drawling tempo to fit the subject. And where Lincoln himself is not concerned, this has a clogging effect. With any ordinary trick actor the pauses, jew's-harping and untangling of feet would have become a pure bore. But John Ford didn't have trick acting, and when he takes his time he never throws it away. The long sequence of fair-day in town is a fine example of the way he can make use of period color and scene and incident to give life to the story; he is a spendthrift with actual air and trees and water throughout. The trial scene is the big dramatic part, and comes over well as such; the best Ford manner shows in the dark and breathless struggle in the clearing at night; but the best things as a whole are the solid rightness of each thing used, and the shrewd way the main theme was given its head.

Henry Fonda shares top credit. He has played so many young-romantic parts as to be known everywhere in his own character; the part here is that death-trap to actors of the man whose later days became a national legend and stone statue; and the story demanded a genuinely rustic clumsiness covered with the constant implicit dignity that an "impersonation" like Mr. Donat's Mr. Chips would simply ruin. Well, he did it. His delivery was good, his carriage was good, his dance steps at the ball were wonderful. But he did it mainly on some rare and unshakable belief in what he was doing and in himself which goes beyond the most brilliant or veteran technique. In the way this shambling mixture of bewilderment, sweetness, tarnal humor and gall is held together, the character does not have to be an exact Abe, being something Abe himself wouldn't be ashamed of.

As a movie it might have been made stronger. It surely could have been shortened, toughened up in its weak parts (the anxious mother and all). And the symbolic mess of the ending could have been so easily wiped out by simply letting the "Battle Hymn" music come up on the sound track and the camera go up the trail as Abe says he guesses he won't go back just yet; he'll just walk on, far as the top of that hill. But as it stands, the movie carries out its difficult job without raising its voice, moving people more than it probably thought to. Its simple good faith and under-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Bandwagon

Talk of Security for All Is Called
False Yawping of Demagogues
Mark Sullivan Cites Case of Dionnes to Show Some
Are Born to Be Overprivileged and That Nature
Recognizes No New Deal Theories
–Headline in The New York Herald Tribune.

Disqualified

The lawyers complained that the juror, John Henry Mosely, of Yonkers, had failed to reveal that he had an especial interest in law enforcement. They said that if that had been known at the time he was examined for service on the jury the defense might have used a peremptory challenge. *– From The New York World-Telegram.*

Alas, Poor Yoicks!

The titular poem, "Huntsman, What Quarry?" carries the singular beauty of her most impressive verse, taking for its theme the lust of the hunt and its magic words, "Hoick! Hoick!" *– From a syndicated review of Edna St. Vincent Millay's new volume of verse, picked up in Jennie B. Gardner's book column in The Memphis, Tenn., Commercial Appeal.*

The Redcoats Are Coming!

City officials, it is understood, were at a loss as to what order to give policemen relating to their conduct if a volatile spectator should so far forget himself as to wave an arm or otherwise move as the King and Queen [of England] passed [up through Manhattan]. It was not known whether such a citizen should be rendered harmless by a blow . . . or whether a policeman should fling himself upon the citizen and hold him. . . . No official mention has been made as yet, either, as to whether the guards perched on lofty roofs should be armed with rifles or machine guns. *– News story in The New York World-Telegram.*

Keep Your Ocean Clean

CUBA ORDERS REFUGEE
SHIP TO GO AWAY
Say German Liner with 917
Jews Must Sail at Once
Boats Will Follow It to Pick up Suicides
– From a headline in The New York Herald Tribune.

Boo!

Browder is a man with a sponge-rubber upper lip. It has an Adolf Hitler mustache on it. When the Communist leader talks his lip jumps all over the lower reaches of his face, right, left, up, down and out.

When Browder pronounces the word "Trotskyite" the lip rises up and out until one can see all the teeth beneath. – *From The Los Angeles Times.*

Our readers are invited to contribute to this column and $1 will be paid for each item used. Address The Bandwagon, care of The New Republic. Please enclose the original clipping. – THE EDITORS

Correspondence

Broun and "The Grapes of Wrath"

SIR: Heywood Broun assails Steinbeck for being too obscene and too plainly outspoken in certain passages in his book "Grapes of Wrath" [The New Republic, May 31]. Needless to say, numerous critics have also pointed out this commonplace, and to my mind, unnecessary fact. After all, why didn't Broun write his little "précis" when he read "Ulysses"? What made him wait until 1939 . . . to begin criticizing realistic literature? Don't you think Mr. Broun's little sermon was dated at least a quarter of a century? Had Broun failed to sign his name to the article I could have sworn it was written by a staff member of The Chicago Tribune and diabolically inserted into the pages of The New Republic.

It is simply astounding to think that the man who wrote the magnificent articles defending Sacco and Vanzetti, who fought with Roosevelt on the Supreme Court question, and who later broke with The Nation because in his own words it was "cluttered up with liberals who have been springing out of odd corners" could be the same man who wrote a thinly disguised criticism of realism and the abjectness of modern life!

Chicago, Ill. STUART BRENT

SIR: I never thought to live to see the day when I would come upon the banalities, "Of course I respect the complete integrity in a column by Heywood Broun. It is the kind of device and they are the kind of phrases from which I feel Broun would have shrunk as from a scorpion's sting a few years ago.

Flemington, N. J. A. G. TRENT

SIR: May I refer your columnist, Mr. Heywood Broun, to page 214 of "The Grapes of Wrath." There he will note that the phoniness he deplores results from his own careless reading. How otherwise could he maintain that the yarn of the "boy who owned the cow" was "presented as something springing right out of the anecdotage of the sharecroppers." Transport drivers are not sharecroppers and their stories are more likely than not to originate in Manhattan. And since this "dirty little story" comes from their lips, Steinbeck did not intend it as a "native flower."

This error would scarcely be worth pointing out if Mr. Broun had not insisted on making such a major discovery of it in his May 31 column.

Wauwatosa, Wis. MAYNARD WATSON

SIR: I was damn disappointed in Heywood Broun when he began slinging faint praise at Steinbeck's "The Grapes of Wrath." He says he isn't a literary critic, but I doubt if even one of that tin-tongued brotherhood could have done a better

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Colonial Corrections

SIR: Mr. Frank C. Hanighen's article on colonial policies in the issue of May 10 contains the statement that "Twenty thousand Dutch rule sixty million natives." The first figure should be two hundred and forty thousand. This is not a mere misprint, one zero inadvertently omitted by the linotyper. No, Mr. Hanighen took it from that equally trustworthy authority on Far Eastern affairs, Mr. Wilbur Burton, who gave that figure in Asia, February, 1939. Mr. Hanighen's other assertion that "The education of natives, who are 97-percent illiterate, is discouraged" by the Dutch government, is taken from the same source.

Allow me to refer Mr. Hanighen to the April issue of Asia, where the corrected figures are given. . . .

Columbia University, New York City S. J. BARNOUW

That Picket Line in Portland

SIR: In an editorial paragraph in the May 24 issue of The New Republic describing the picketing of the steamer "William Luckenbach" at Portland, Oregon, there are certain inaccuracies.

The picket line was placed by members of the Maritime Office Employees, an affiliate of the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union. These members were discharged by Luckenbach in 1937 for union activities. Since September of 1938 the company has refused to comply with the NLRB decision ordering these members reinstated.

The picket line was observed, not formed, by the Portland longshoremen and the National Maritime Union sailors who went ashore at the time the picket line was placed.

An arrest of one of the pickets under the Oregon anti-picketing law resulted in the declaration by the longshoremen that the picket line had only been removed from the Luckenbach dock to the county jail. The longshoremen and seamen continued to observe a "ghost" picket line.

I was the picket arrested, whose ghost continued to walk the Luckenbach ship.

Portland, Ore. GEORGE CRON

The Jews in Palestine

SIR: In an editorial paragraph in the issue of Wednesday, May 31, you make the following statement in criticism of the new British White Paper on Palestine: "It does nothing to correct the grave abuses in both Jewish and Arab communities, abuses rising from landlordism, deep poverty and exploitation."

That there are abuses in the Arab communities is well known, responsibility for which must be shared by the government and by the Arab effendi class. But these abuses have not arisen in the Jewish communities, which cannot be said to suffer deep poverty and exploitation, or from the effects of landlordism.

There is no poverty among the Jews of Palestine, and no economic exploitation in any real sense. The larger part of the land owned by Jews has been purchased through the Jewish National Fund, which holds title to all this and in the name of the Jewish people, and which makes fair and generous arrangements for the payment of rent by its tenants. The Jewish National Fund is the instrument of Jewish national colonization.

A large number of the agricultural colonies in Palestine are successful coöperatives, in which the interests are communal, not individual. The interests of labor are protected by a labor organization, in which there is a membership of over 100,000. In this membership are included agricultural workers as well as industrial workers. The labor organization has introduced many features of social service, such as social medicine, hospitalization development of the country. They carry the larger share of responsibility for all social, economic and political affairs, as well as in the Zionist Organization. Jewish labor in Palestine has introduced social and economic methods that have evoked the admiration of the British Labor Party and of labor leaders in the United States.

There is an obvious confusion in this respect. This confusion is frequently met with in liberal circles, where few take the trouble to investigate and ascertain the facts, but assume, as a matter of course, that Jews and Arabs are subject to the same economic conditions. The fact is not appreciated that the Jews have been forced to build up an economic life of their own, owing to the antagonistic attitude adopted by the Arabs. In their own economic world, the Jews have made an earnest endeavor to maintain the highest social and economic standards.

LOUIS LIPSKY,

New York City The Jewish Agency for Palestine

Puerto Rico: Crown Colony?

SIR: A new Governor has been appointed for Puerto Rico. It sounds to me very much like another appointment made for a Crown Colony in the British Empire. In reality we should say that here we have a President's Colony, similar to the Crown Colonies of England. Does the President realize that Puerto Ricans are far better qualified to choose their own Governor? At least, they are just as well qualified as any state of the Union.

It is current news now that Puerto Rico must be transformed into a Western Gibraltar. I believe that the comparison is not a happy one. Gibraltar is a desert rock and Puerto Rico, awful to say, has a population of 1,700,000. How will the federal government transform the Island into a Rock of the West? A more proper comparison and name, I believe, would be the Albania of America.

Topeka, Kan. JULES VELASQUEZ

From The New Republic Mail Bag

A small flurry of letters came in about Barbara Wertheim's "We Saw Democracy Fail" (May 17). Nicholas Carnovale of Chicago and Ellen Price of Tuscon, Arizona, were extravagant in their praise. But Robert V. Costello, of New York City, flies into a tantrum about The New Republic, Miss Wertheim, The New Masses, the Loyalists in Spain (and there we stopped reading). . . . Marion E. Lewis of Marshfield, Massachusetts, proposes a reform in our secondary-school system. As a teacher she has observed that at least 25 percent of her students are "hand-minded" and it is pointless to try to train them to live by the process, primarily, of reading books. This 25 percent ought to be taught by movies, conversation and debate and the radio, in addition to training in the manual and domestic arts.

Thomas P. Jackson of Hollywood, California, wants us to print Roy Tozier's "Moseley of the Fifth Column" (June 7) on twenty-four sheets and paste it up on every billboard in the country. . . . Roland J. Sawyer of Boston sends us an interesting clipping from an article by Donovan Richardson in The Christian Science Monitor: "Heard a man tell the other day of receiving a letter from Germany saying, 'The stamp on this envelope commemorates our Leader's birthday and you may like it for your collection.' Acting on the suggestion, he took it off and found underneath, 'We are starving.' "

A committee has been formed in Washington, D. C., to raise funds for a mural depicting Marian Anderson's Easter Day concert, writes Edward Bruce of the Treasury Department, its chairman. Contributions should be sent to Mr. Jesse H. Mitch-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in Review

Notes on a Writers' Congress

I WAS FAGGED OUT on the last day of the American Writers' Congress. Having attended seven meetings, not to speak of parties, business luncheons and a reception; having joined in some lively discussions and listened to more papers than could be remembered, I felt justified in going back to my unweeded garden without waiting for the final session at which resolutions were to be adopted and officers elected. Still it was a good congress, by far the best of the three that have been held by the League of American Writers.

This time there were more writers present, including more from foreign cities like Dublin and Copenhagen and Hollywood. There was more attention paid to strictly literary matters. Except for the public meeting at Carnegie Hall, where ex-President Benes told what had happened to Czecho-Slovakia since the Germans marched in, there was not much talk of the political situation; it was an ominous background that was taken for granted. The problem around which most of the discussion centered was that of finding a wider audience for good books and plays and poems.

The closed sessions, held at the New School for Social Research, were chiefly devoted to the different literary crafts—fiction, poetry, criticism, stage, screen, radio—although there was also a session organized for and by the exiled writers. Some of these meetings were planned with real ingenuity. The fiction session was one of them; it consisted of five-minute papers by novelists and short-story writers, each of whom discussed his own type of narrative. Thus, Sylvia Townsend Warner talked on historical fiction, Dashiell Hammett on tempo in fiction and Christina Stead on the many-charactered novel, to choose three examples from more than a dozen. With the story-tellers speaking for themselves, the usually voluble critics were invited to listen and be silent. But the critics had a chance to talk at their own session, where they were properly segregated. There were no prepared papers. Instead a single novel, "The Grapes of Wrath," was taken as a subject for almost clinical dissection, with each critic approaching it from his special point of view and judging it as symbolism, American folktale, heroic legend, social drama or political pamphlet. I was glad that John Steinbeck wasn't there to listen, not because the general verdict was unfavorable—far from it—but simply because he would have been so confused by conflicting ideas and subtle distinctions that it might have become impossible for him to write another novel.

The poetry session, which I didn't get a chance to attend, was concerned with the new and old mediums through which poets might reach more than their present quite specialized audience. The screen session listened to some rather jubilant reports from Hollywood, besides equipment furnished by CBS and editors present from all the broadcasting systems to explain and demonstrate just what could be done over the air. But the fact is that the whole congress had the air of being planned with foresight and judgment. Considering that it had been organized as a collective undertaking by writers, who are individualists by definition and quite unused to organizing their own lives or anything else more complicated than a chapter in a novel, it was something to feel proud about.

Afterwards, hoeing between the bean rows in my garden, I reflected that this congress, in addition to the high aims that were set for it and partially achieved, might serve an humble and unexpected purpose. It might help to establish human relations among writers.

If someone asked just what I meant by that, I might answer him by referring to the way writers lived during the 1920's. In those days they met one another chiefly at publishers' cocktail parties (always described in the invitations as teas). Judging from what could be heard and seen at those functions, I should say that most writers attended them to boast about the sales of their latest books, to complain about reviews and royalties, to exchange compliments or veiled insults, to flirt and to get free drinks. All these acts could of course be called human relations, but they might be described more accurately as feline relations—considering that cats also come together to boast, quarrel, make love and sniff catnip. Writers, like cats, regarded every colleague as a rival.

From those days I don't recall hearing much literary conversation, either at publishers' teas or anywhere else (except among the Dadaists in Paris). It wasn't that writers weren't seriously interested in their own profession; quite on the contrary they burned with an almost religious enthusiasm. But they hesitated to talk about anything so close to their hearts as literature. Like cats they regarded themselves as solitary animals and kept their thoughts to themselves.

Of course the Writers' Congress didn't change all that in three days; it was merely the sign of a change that had already taken place. It was, however, the first occasion on which I heard a great many writers talking about their own problems without being boastful or snickering or self-conscious—simply talking because they had something to say. Such an interchange of ideas will certainly transform none of them into geniuses, but it will keep some of them from making mistakes that others have made already, and learned to avoid. It will help to create a general pattern of ideas and thus make it easier to produce good books in certain fields—for example, novels and dramas dealing with contemporary problems. And it will certainly encourage writers to think of one another not as rivals but as partners in the same undertaking and as human beings to be treated with consideration.

There is a story that might explain just what I don't

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

come tomorrow. The meeting broke up late. One writer, since distinguished as an ultra-radical politician, stepped into the street and slammed the door in the face of a pregnant woman. I don't think he saw that she was pregnant; he was absorbed in his revolutionary dream and may not even have noticed that she existed. But from that moment I began to find something false in his literary pleas for the working class. You can't lead them toward a better society by slamming the door in their faces. MALCOLM COWLEY

The Trimmed Lamp

The Bridegroom Cometh, by Waldo Frank. New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company. $2.75.

THIS NOVEL is a sequel to "The Death and Birth of David Markand," published in 1935. Unlike most sequels, it is richer and more important than its predecessor, which had too many brilliant expository passages, too few memorable characters and a little too much mystical feeling that never got rooted solidly in the action. In "The Bridegroom Cometh" these faults are very largely pruned away; the book is a three-dimensional structure of action and perception, a vivid picture of American life in the years between 1914 and 1924.

In the story of Mary Donald the writer has found his symbol—his "objective correlative," in Eliot's phrase—by which he evokes in the reader the emotion that had stirred his own feeling. This kind of adequate symbol has been rare in Frank's fiction, perhaps because of his inward vision and philosophic cast of mind. Here he achieves it by fully presenting one significant character, a girl whose grave, pure drive toward conscious living is hampered (but not defeated) by the chaotic world in which she comes to maturity.

When the story opens Mary is fifteen, child of a weak religious fanatic who has allowed his young wife to die of neglect, and his daughters to grow up unhappily, while he pursues "salvation." A foggy, frustrated girl, Mary goes to school in a little New England town, fearing her harsh stepmother, loving her twin sister Martha with aching intensity. At college she studies blindly, a little stupidly, her intellectual curiosity still deadened by the religious dogmas of her youth, her awareness that she is *alive* in the real world still blunted by the same flat certitudes.

Awakening is slow. Neither her job as social worker in New York City nor her marriage to Willem Taess, a prosperous young business man, serves to release the potentialities that sleep within her. But when she leaves Willem—and his stuffy successful life, now hateful to her—that first real act of will brings her into sharper focus with reality. It is a hard path she has taken. Unwilling to teach in "progressive" schools, or to interview adopted parents for the Parents' Aid Society (since she is nauseated by the unreal cant of these professions), she becomes a clerk in a department store. Still later she works in a factory, where she meets union leaders and revolutionaries. Finally the sum of her observation and personal experience adds up to a knowledge of those forces in modern society that move or mangle human lives.

the daily papers, because they told her nothing that she really had to know. Her deepest need has been the need to love—to love not only a man but life itself. And the slow ripening that is fulfilled within her is a ripening of her integral capacity to love. When she meets David Markand she is no longer a thwarted, confused girl—slightly neurotic and almost wholly unaware of the meaning of her environment. She has become a woman who can love life, with all its harshness, and who knows where the enemies of life are to be found.

No brief synopsis can give an adequate idea of the novel's extraordinary richness. Crowded with minor characters, sharply observed and shrewdly presented, its range includes a fanatical Revelationist community in Massachusetts; the drab lives of city workers and the stuffy lives of the respectable middle class; a strange sultry love affair between Martha, Mary's beautiful sister, and a gangster; the Communist movement of the early 1920's, with its dead-pan sectarian grimness as well as its heroic courage; and the post-war New York intelligentsia, with their brawls and cocktail parties, their glib talk of Freud and politics.

Here is a real picture of post-war America; and it is a picture of frustration—particularly for American women, whose unsatisfied lives make up so much of this social panorama. Promiscuous women who take their "half-men" knowing well that twenty such are no substitute for one real man; women whose thwarted hungers turn toward avarice, the labor movement, even death; cheap women and women who are afraid; flappers, farm women and workers at machines. Against this background of fragmentary living the quiet strength of Mary Donald, her desire for *wholeness* of experience, take on heroic significance.

"The Bridegroom Cometh" is a wise book, written out of a deep sense of the urgency and cry of life. Its philosophic basis, fruit of much thought as well as mystical insight, is that the true basis of democracy is the religious instinct; that the universal enemy is the fear of life, the neurotic will toward death. But in this view religion has nothing to do with creed nor is it rooted in transcendental sanctions. It is the deepest drive of the human organism (the human spirit, if you will) toward a conscious, creative marriage with the world. Placing this integrity of experience squarely at the heart of his system of values, Waldo Frank evaluates every economic and cultural problem, every program of change and social revolution, by one standard: Will it release the individual from fear, from unconsciousness, from inability to love?

This wisdom is needed in our era, and a novel that communicates it so powerfully is an important event in American letters. It is an authentic imaginative work, moreover, its insights emerging, not in exposition but in terms of character, environment and human action. One may carp a little, to be sure, at occasional passages of a kind of lush ineptitude that Frank never seems to weed entirely out of his work. One may regret that a writer with such insight and a message so vital to our time is not more concerned with the refinements of technique, with problems of rhythm, pace, and the terse and perfect phrase. But the book stands,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Deathbed of a Republic

We Shall Live Again, by Maurice Hindus. New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company. 373 pages. $3.

MR. HINDUS was an eyewitness of the Czecho-Slovakian crisis from beginning to end. His book is an attempt to describe the setting and development of that tragedy, not by means of political analysis, but in terms of human experience. In essence his method is to describe his encounters with people in all parts of the now vanished republic. From time to time he draws upon his knowledge of its history, and occasionally he inserts a few telling figures. This, of course, is a bald description, leaving out of count Mr. Hindus' enthusiasm, generosity and frequent charm of style.

Sometimes, especially in the early chapters, he is a little too luxuriant. The contrasts and likenesses between Czecho-Slovakia and other countries must be established at all costs, even if he has to comment upon the manner of parting the hair in Prague. And he finds it necessary to explain why the president of a gymnastic society was a little paunchy. This is Mr. Hindus' old difficulty of selection, and his practised and affectionate readers know how to detect and skip such things before they come to them. I confess to an easy doubt, too, about his picture of Czecho-Slovakia before the crisis. That it was a profoundly democratic country, cultured, disciplined and attractive, we already know, but according to the author it was rather better than Arcady.

Mr. Hindus tells us on page 18 that ever since 1620 the Czechs had no class to uphold or perpetuate a sense of social superiority, or any marked class distinctions. On page 116, however, he gives us a very interesting account of how the Agrarian Party, from being a democratic institution favoring land distribution and coöperatives, became "the most powerful and most reactionary political party in Czecho-Slovakia," directed principally by men of substantial acreages. Having discovered this, Mr. Hindus should at once have set off into the countryside to seek fresh encounters which might have illustrated the process. We might have had a little less of his delightful writing about wedding feasts and folksong, it is true, but we might also have understood more clearly why the Agrarian Party categorically refused to permit Russian armies on their soil in the terrible days of the crisis. The Agrarians may have had no highly developed sense of class distinction, except, of course, the trifling one of preferring to keep their lands in a German province rather than risk them in a free Czecho-Slovakia. And after Munich one of Mr. Hindus' friends is reported as saying that the Agrarians wished to make a fascist country out of the remnants of the state.

Yet there is much of merit in this first part, including an excellent refutation of the argument about suffering or ill provided minorities. In Czecho-Slovakia, Mr. Hindus points out, there was one German school for every 862 German inhabitants, while in Prussia there is one school for every 1,112. Polish schools were provided at the rate of one for 809 Poles; in Poland itself the rate was one for 952. When the Poles seized Teschen, thus taking 76,238 Poles and 120,639 Czechs, the first act of the victors was to close all Czech schools.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hearted Jan in his embitterment declare, "I want to make of myself a Fascist and a barbarian," one understands the extent of a people's suffering. It is no wonder that men and women of his acquaintance declared to Mr. Hindus that they hated even the language of England. One is hardly astonished, though one is horrified, to find that the half-Jewish girl whom one has repeatedly met in Mr. Hindus' pages bears herself serenely in a time of almost universal dejection, because she carries in her purse eight tablets of poison.

RALPH BATES

Yale Loses One Vote

Death of a Yale Man, by Malcolm Ross. New York: Farrar and Rinehart. 365 pages. $2.50.

ALL THE IVY ORATIONS, valedictories, and Young Men, You Are on the Threshold of Life addresses of this season, if put end to end, would probably blow away. But what "Death of a Yale Man" has to say, in its indirect fashion, will be sound advice for a long time to come.

Twenty years ago Malcolm Ross was graduated from Yale out of Hotchkiss. You couldn't have picked him out of his class album, except that he was slightly taller, slightly more athletic and a trifle busier with extra-curricular activities than the Yale average. But his eyes, like those of his classmates, were fixed upon "the pleasant privileges" America has to offer its bright young college-trained business men in reward for conformity to the conventions of its paternalistic capitalism. Quite naturally, Ross got his first job as a Wall Street runner for Lee, Higginson and Company, the routine beginning of the logical career in finance. Today, by virtue of a small personal revolution, he is an important officer of the National Labor Relations Board.

Mike Ross, the Yale man, put one foot in his grave the day he discovered that he couldn't go on selling bonds. He hated the job; it made his hands clammy and his tongue thick and he couldn't realize that the paper he peddled was really factories and machinery and the work of the men who made them go. So he and his best friend, caught in the same predicament, made a compact to quit their jobs. They would go adventuring in the hinterland and learn to live by the work their hands could do. And a Yale man's hands, on a pipe-threading wrench, are hardly any different from anyone's else.

The adventure began as pure romanticism. It led from Texas oil fields to Arizona copper mines, through aviation, reporting, editing, coal-mining, the NRA and the Consumers' Advisory Board and finally the NLRB. Along the way the Yale man died completely and the romantic discovered his adventure far more compelling in fact than in anticipation. Mike Ross became a radical—he would like to see America try democracy at whatever cost to comfortable people.

You don't have to be graduating from college to profit by the book. Anybody who wonders whether he has picked out the right career will be interested in how Ross chose his. But I recommend it especially to men in the classes of '37 to '41 inclusive, at Yale and elsewhere. Mike

A Study in Black and White

After Freedom: A Study of Races in the Deep South, by Hortense Powdermaker. New York: The Viking Press. 428 pages. $3.

DR. POWDERMAKER combines anthropology with psychiatry in her study of a functioning community in the Deep South. Cottonville is the fictitious name she gives the Mississippi town to which she applied these two methods of research. It is a typical rural, cotton-growing community within the influence of the plantation system, and deeply set in the economic and racial traditions of the Old South. Although the study is general in interest and implication, the data are drawn almost wholly from Negro sources, and the institutions given most thorough attention are those developed by the Negro group in this special setting.

There is a creed of racial relations embedded in the traditions of the area amounting almost to a religion. This creed prescribes not only the behavior but the sentiments and attitudes of both Negroes and whites. White attitudes express themselves through characteristic social mechanisms —taboos, social segregation and the rigid limits set on participation by Negroes in the general culture. Underlying many of the attitudes and the aggressive behavior are fear, both vague and sharply defined, a concern for the maintenance of personal and racial prestige, and an implied need for scapegoats and underdogs.

The social life of the Negroes is conditioned by their unique status with respect to the white community and also to those institutions regulating intimate aspects of their lives. The plantation system determines the economic pattern for the entire community, and the chronically precarious state of agriculture under this system keeps the level of life low for the large mass of Negro tenants, and insecure for many of the rest.

The Negro family, partly as a result of the historical circumstances out of which it evolved, is strongly matriarchal in pattern. Special group sanctions with respect to illegitimacy, adopted children, marriage and separation, give uniqueness to these family patterns. The sex factor appears to be dominant in the group life of the Negroes and becomes conspicuous when studied in relation to the sex mores of American society in general. Color variations among the Negroes have social as well as economic and biological implications. The social institutions and rituals developed by the Negroes provide a medium for the essential internal cohesion of the group, and an emotional outlet as well. Outmoded beliefs and practices based upon superstition are fostered by cultural isolation.

The Negro's response to his situation is revealed in patterns of behavior, both consciously and unconsciously developed, toward the dominant white society; it is also revealed in a wide array of personality problems, in inverted aggressive behavior within his own group, in a new attitude of skepticism toward the traditional assumptions of the white group, and in migration. The best example of the changing mores appears in the differences in response noted by the author for the three generations of Negroes since

The Ideas Men Live By

So stupendous is the cultural transformation at work today that only three previous eras of human experience compare with it. At the same time, we seek to control the new empire of machines with social ideas and institutions that date somewhere between the Stone Age and 1750. What are the key problems that spring from this unspanned gulf? How can we master them?

To understand today's social questions clearly, to discuss them convincingly and to think originally, you will want this monumental work by Dr. Barnes. In logical sequence are discussions of such varied problems as Propaganda, Taxes, Crime, Industrial Warfare, Unemployment, Depressions, The Race Problem, Prostitution, Revolution in Country Life, Sex Problems, Poverty, Relief and the other crises in society's transition. The complete picture is succinctly, graphically, readably presented.

1000 pp. $5 at bookstores

A PRENTICE-HALL BOOK

WRITE, WIRE, OR TELEPHONE TO

New Republic Books
40 East 49th Street
New York City
Tel. ELd. 5-4000

FOR BOOKS OF ANY PUBLISHER TO BE SENT, POSTAGE FREE TO ADDRESSES IN THE U. S. A.

STUDENT SPECIAL

A Student Tour limited in membership offering a Special Program both in Europe and the Soviet Union visiting: London, Copenhagen, Helsingfors, Leningrad, Moscow, Kharkov, Dnieproges, Sevastopol, the Soviet Crimea in Yalta, Odessa, Kiev . . . also Warsaw and Paris.

47 DAYS — Sailing July 6th. All-inclusive—3rd Atlantic **$348**

Also a wide selection of other tours to Europe, Near East and Soviet Union, conducted by prominent leaders, ranging from 28 to 64 days and priced from $298 up with Atlantic passage 3rd class.

For further details apply

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

parents doubted their essential inferiority but acted as if they believed in it; the children neither believe nor pretend to believe in it.

Significantly, the group is in process of acculturation. The test of this process, so the author believes, is the extent to which the Negroes take over and incorporate the patterns and standards of the white society. Although this objective is sometimes regarded with skepticism and even regret by whites, it appears to be the present direction of Negro development.

Dr. Powdermaker has brought to this study the careful training of an anthropologist, and a capacity for understanding subtleties in the racial experiences of both white and Negro. An intimate realism is conveyed in the frequent documentary citations, rich in human values. There is some unevenness in the data, doubtless resulting from the heavy preponderance of female informants. In the further study of a total community of this type, it will be necessary in the future to give more attention to the actual patterns and standards of the white group. These are usually inferred from the standards and ideals of American culture as a whole, with some loss of local accuracy. It will be particularly valuable to make a thorough study of the Poor Whites, who constitute a distinct class, living under conditions no better than the poorer Negroes. Meanwhile Dr. Powdermaker's book is a valuable addition to sociological literature, and to methodology as well.

CHARLES S. JOHNSON

New Books: A Reader's List

THE WORLD OVER: 1938, edited by Joseph Hilton Smyth and Charles Angoff (Harrison-Hilton, $4). A detailed chronological record of the principal events that have taken place in every country, with commentaries and a handy index. Useful as a handbook of a momentous year.

CRIME IS A BUSINESS, by John C. R. MacDonald (Stanford U., $3). The old confidence game, painstakingly described in all its ninety-three permutations, by a veteran police authority on "bunco."

THE 1940 BOOK OF SMALL HOUSES, by the Editors of The Architectural Forum (Simon and Schuster, $1.96). Plans, photographs and specifications of 144 houses that cost from $5,000 to $25,000. Sound advice for home builders: if this reviewer had read it in time he might have saved himself many headaches and a second mortgage.

THE PORTUGAL OF SALAZAR, by Michael Derrick (Campion, $2). An apologia for the corporative state as developed under the aegis of the dictator Salazar. One thing the author doesn't tell you about him is that Salazar has performed the almost impossible feat of reducing the living standard of the Portuguese masses.

DEMOCRACY, BY THOMAS JEFFERSON, edited by Saul K. Padover (Appleton-Century, $2.50). A skillful selection and arrangement from thousands of letters and other writings of Jefferson, expressing in integrated form the salient political and social ideas by which he was animated. Jefferson on democracy always makes good reading.

MEDIEVAL PAGEANT, by John Revell Reinhard (Harcourt, Brace, $4). A compilation of 150 stories, from the eighth century to the seventeenth. The original texts from Ire-

Reader," with apologies to the "Learned Friend." Many of the stories are quite good, and inaccessible elsewhere.

THE EARLY EMPIRES OF CENTRAL ASIA, by William Montgomery McGovern (North Carolina, $4). A treatise on the rise and fall of the early Scythian and Hunnish empires, covering the period from 3000 B.C. to 600 A.D. It is written in a style accessible to the layman and contains an exhaustive bibliography.

SERVICE ENTRANCE: Memoirs of a Park Avenue Cook, by Kyra Goritzina (Carrick and Evans, $2.50). A story of manners and men in the American upper brackets by an intelligent and dignified refugee. She and her husband knew how to be first-rate servants because they had once commanded first-rate service themselves.

IMMORTAL EASE, by Kathleen Coyle (Dutton, $2.50). An unusual novel about a lovely lady poet whom the publishers compare to Elinor Wylie. She keeps breaking the hearts of people who don't perceive her own silent suffering. Written in Miss Coyle's curiously oblique, subtle style that is likely to disturb as many readers as it pleases.

HARVEST, by Jean Giono (Viking, $2.50). An earlier, shorter and less mature novel than "The Song of the World." There is nothing here that we don't find better expressed in the later works; there is the same theme of the return to simplicity, the same hatred for cities and the same unrelieved solemnity of tone.

Notes About Books and Magazines

The University of Chicago Press announces the preparation of an eight-volume text of Chaucer's "Canterbury Tales" for fall publication. The collection, edited by John M. Manly and Edith Rickert—who was his chief collaborator until her death in 1938—includes the variants of all eighty-three manuscripts. Pre-publication price, $25; post-publication, $40.

For the most interesting article submitted on the causes of war—without using the words "democracy" or "fascism"—The North Georgia Review (Clayton, Georgia) offers a prize of $50. The articles must not exceed 3,500 words in length and must be in before June 25.

Among other interesting items in the second issue (Spring-Summer, 1939) of Twice A Year, a semi-annual journal of literature, the arts and civil liberties, are reprints of the letters written by Randolph Bourne about Europe from 1912 to 1914.

Contributors

RICHARD J. WALSH is president of the John Day Company, publishers, and editor of Asia magazine.

NORBERT GUTERMAN, who has a doctorate from the Sorbonne, writes for magazines here and in Paris.

REBECCA PITTS has contributed to numerous magazines. She is now in Chicago editing the Indiana Guide for Federal Writers' Project.

RALPH BATES, in addition to his novels and short stories of Spanish life ("Lean Men," "The Olive Field," "Sirocco"), has also written many articles on international affairs.

BRUCE BLIVEN JR. is a member of the editorial staff of The New Republic. He is a Harvard man.

CHARLES S. JOHNSON is director of the department of Social Sciences at Fisk University. His numerous books include "The Shadow of the Plantation" and "The Negro College Graduate."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED